

MAGAZINE OF AMERICAN HISTORY

VOL. VIII

JUNE 1882

No. 6

THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS

THE Whig party of 1840 was a party of opposition simply ; it was a unity pieced up by direct admission of contrarieties in the fundamental points of it, which, like the toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image, might cleave together but could never incorporate. Mr. Webster described it as "a party made up, from the first, of different opinions and principles, of men of every political complexion, uniting together to make a change in the administration. They were men of strong States rights principles, of strong Federal principles, men of extreme tariff and men of extreme anti-tariff notions," constituting, in fine, a political organization of which little could be expected "unless animated by a spirit of conciliation and harmony, of union and sympathy."

Before the Whig convention met at Harrisburg, Mr. Clay, as is well known, was the most popular man in the ranks of the majority element of the party, comprising the old National Republicans of other days ; while John Tyler stood at the head of the minority section, styled strict constructionists or States Rights men ; a class which, though lately allied with the Democrats, had come to view the course of the leaders of that party as more hostile to the reserved powers of the States than the tendencies of those who had been arrayed against them in 1828 on the first election of Jackson. The great rally of the Jeffersonian elements of that time against the National Republicans had swept the country. Jackson, however, lent his favor to a class of men who, by drawing the masses whither they pleased through the great personal popularity possessed by him, strangely impressed upon the party, whose watchword had been "strict construction," the most palpable features of centralization. Prominent among these were Mr. Van Buren, Secretary of State, Mr. Benton of the Senate, and Mr. Blair, editor of the *Globe*, the central organ of the party in Washington. The proclamation of General Jackson, in 1833, defining the character of the Government in the most national colors, the arbitrary removal of the de-

posits from the United States Bank, the vast extension of executive patronage, the "spoils" doctrine openly avowed by Mr. Van Buren's administration, and the pet scheme of an "Independent Treasury" under executive control, were all so many evidences of this strong national spirit--tending not as now in the direction of the Legislative department but in that of the Executive. The result was a tremendous rupture in the ranks and the incipient formation of the Whig party, in 1834, by the secession of the States Rights element. The Van Buren following became known under the odious name of Loco-focos, and were equally detested by Clay men and Tyler men. The differences animating these two factors of the opposition were too inveterate for a speedy accommodation, and no common candidate could be agreed upon in 1836. In 1839 a desperate effort was made toward concentration of their powers, and detestation of Loco-focoism enabled it to succeed. The friends of strict construction held a private conference with Mr. Clay, and in it he distinctly pledged himself to pursue a practical course upon the subject of the differences existing between them on questions of principle, such as the bank, the tariff, and internal improvements. While not required to change his views upon their expediency or constitutionality, he freely promised, if elevated to the Presidency, to give them the go-by during his term of office. Mr. Tyler, as leader of the States Rights men, was to receive the second office.¹ Thus the understanding between the two was complete. Mr. Tyler attended the convention in the interest of Mr. Clay, and did all he could to secure his nomination. But active agencies were at work which made his efforts in vain. The high tariff party did not like Mr. Clay's course on the compromise act of 1833, and the anti-masons were opposed to him because he was a mason. The dissensions were even greater than those of the Democratic party in 1860, and Mr. Tyler says "a platform would have scattered us to the winds." Mr. Clay's name gave place to William H. Harrison's, on the grounds of *availability*, and the convention adjourned without publishing a platform. Mr. Tyler, on the other hand, not having the same embarrassments to contend against as Mr. Clay, had no difficulty in securing the second prize.

The election followed, resulting in the sweeping victory of the Whigs. The doggerel of "Tippecanoe and Tyler too" had greater effect than the celebrated song of "Lillibullero" in 1688. In the letters and speeches of General Harrison, during the canvass, he avowed himself a firm believer in his old views of strict construction, as held in 1800, when he supported the Jeffersonian party of that day. Thus both the new President and Vice-President occupied the anomalous position of hostility to the secret wishes of the majority of their party; and serious consequences en-

sued. For no sooner had the opposition achieved its signal victory over the Democrats, so-called, than Mr. Clay strangely considering himself released from his engagements with the minority element, by his failure to gain the nomination, determined to turn the victory of the whole party to the advantage of his own following by bringing forward the old plans of a Bank, a protective tariff, and internal improvements.

On the inauguration of President Harrison, the White House was constantly beset by a ravenous horde of political advisers. Prominent among those who besieged the new Chief Magistrate was Mr. Clay, who assumed such a domineering and dictatorial air, that the old veteran, in order to preserve some remnant of his former independence, had to severely rebuke him for his freedom. James Lyons, of Richmond, Va., the author of the Virginia Whig address, in a very valuable letter to the *New York World*, of August, 1880, states that "General Harrison told him at his house that Mr. Clay was so violent with him that he was obliged to say to him, 'Mr. Clay, you forget that I am the President.'"

The rush continued; and in one month after his inauguration, worn out by the terrible trials of his position, the poor old man laid down his office for a loftier one on high. His mantle descended upon the shoulders of the less aged and more vigorous Vice-President, John Tyler.

Mr. Tyler, as it was to be expected, almost immediately locked horns with the majority. The old cry was raised by Mr. Clay of a Bank of the United States—though this scheme had been steadily kept out of discussion during the canvass, and never in any way had been an issue in the election. His old friends rallied about him to a man. It was no new taking away of adherents from the President, but it was simply a rallying signal to those who were already, and had been for years, the followers of Mr. Clay. The President was simply where he was before the canvass with his comparatively small party of strict constructionists, now gallantly drawn up against the combined hosts of Federalism and Loco-focoism.

Mr. Lyons thus tells the story of this period: "Mr. Tyler and myself spent the day in discussing the political situation and his duty in respect to the Bank bill. I urged him to approve it upon the ground that it was a question of legal interpretation, and the Supreme Court had been appointed by the constitution to settle such questions. He replied, 'But my oath and speech against the Bank—what will be said of my consistency?' . . . I afterward talked with Mr. Clay, and found him very violent. He said, 'Tyler dares not resist. I will drive him before me!' To which I answered, 'You are mistaken, Mr. Clay; Mr. Tyler wants to approve the bill, but he thinks his oath is in the way, and I, who know him very well,

tell you that when he thinks he is RIGHT he is as obstinate as a bull, and no power on earth can move him.'"

The sequel proved that Mr. Clay utterly failed in his "heading" and "driving" schemes. Mr. Tyler crushed his bank for all time, and proposed his exchequer plan, the very foundation of the present scheme of finance. The National Republicans, or so-called Whigs, suffered severely in the fall elections, and finally Mr. Clay was compelled to abandon his seat in the Senate during March, 1842, bewailing the utter failure of his ambitious plans.

This preface has been drawn out very long, but it is necessary for the reader to have a clear comprehension of the difficulties that surrounded Mr. Tyler, when, at a later date, he took up the question of annexation. He had begun his administration with the settled intention of making Texas a part of the United States as soon as circumstances would permit. That country lay in tempting proximity to us, and had been early settled by emigrants from the States. By the battle of the San Jacinto, April 21, 1836, the Texans had vindicated their claims to liberty and independence, and avenged upon the Mexicans the massacres of the Alamo and Goliad. Wanting, however, in that element of population so necessary to the integrity of her soil, Texas had early turned her attention from motives of interest and favor to terms of a close and intimate character with those happy States she saw so firmly united on the northwest. Having secured the recognition of her independence from President Van Buren, she had, on the 4th of August, 1837, proposed to annex herself to the United States. Mr. Van Buren was probably too much engrossed at that time in his design of the "Independent Treasury" to pay much attention to the application, and the cold shoulder was given to the proposition. The question of annexation, however, though cautiously handled by the politicians of that day, was a growing one, and did not fail to impress its importance upon a number of leading men, among whom was Mr. Tyler. During the first two years of his term his time was too much taken up with the tariff question and other important subjects, causing acrimonious discussion, to permit him to force the issue of annexation. Circumstances continued unfavorable, and Mr. Webster, the Secretary of State, was opposed to the policy. In 1842, Texas having once more applied for admission, the danger became imminent, lest disgusted with her treatment she might never again propose terms of annexation. From this time it became the leading question in the mind of the President, resulting in the withdrawal of Mr. Webster, in May, 1843, though on every other question he had agreed with the executive. Hugh S. Legaré was appointed Secretary of State in the place of Mr. Webster, but his early death,

in June, 1843, after scarcely a month of office, led to the reorganization of the cabinet, and the appointment of Abel P. Upshur as head of the State Department. Mr. Upshur had known the President in early youth, and had been a member of the same debating society in Richmond, Va., when John Tyler, Sr., was Governor of the State. A friendship thus early formed had continued unshaken through all the subsequent years, to find a crowning honor in a worthy and intimate association at the head of the Government. Mr. Tyler, as already mentioned, had early seen the advantage to the country of the annexation of Texas, and had only deferred the attempt to consummate the scheme from the embarrassments surrounding him, and from the want of a proper opportunity to force the issue on the attention of the country. Mr. Upshur was one of those who thought that the importance of the acquisition would at all times justify its undertaking, and was, therefore, with others, zealous in the cause—too prone to overlook those circumstances which may render a thing prudent and proper at one time and extremely impolitic at another. It was indeed one of the highest qualities of Mr. Tyler that in every trying position and occasion of his life he ever retained his perfect composure, coolness, and self-possession. He bided his own time as to Texas, and with remarkable discernment he seized the very juncture when success was most likely to smile upon him.

During the summer following Mr. Legaré's death, and after the appointment of Mr. Upshur to succeed him, this juncture presented itself. Texas, disappointed in her hopes of assistance from the United States, and enfeebled by a constant warfare carried on with Mexico since 1836, was beginning to look abroad for protection against the ceaseless assaults of the mother country. France and England were both approached upon the subject, and seemed disposed to lend a willing ear to her application for interposition. England especially was gracious, and the President knew that much reliance could be placed upon the just jealousy entertained by our people against the grasping character of that country to obtain for him an indorsement of his course at their hands. First, the Northeastern boundary and next the Northwestern had occasioned a world of dispute. Each of these great questions, dragging its weary length along, had succeeded in engendering among the masses a strong spirit of apprehension with regard to the restless aggressions of that ambitious and energetic country. The President, with the breadth of views of a statesman and a lover of his whole country, placed the question of annexation upon the broad ground of the importance of the monopoly of the cotton plant to the country, and the present imminent danger that Texas, weakened as she was by constant warfare, "would speedily throw herself in the arms of other nations already

outstretched to receive her and, manacled by commercial treaties or engagements of a more close and embarrassing character, would be not only lost forever to the United States, but become their most dangerous neighbor."

During the summer and early fall of 1843 the President and his able Secretary applied themselves with zeal to perfecting the scheme of immediate annexation. Their proceedings were conducted very quietly, and had in view the future action of the Senate on the point of ratification. Communication was held with those who controlled the action of the Senate, and he was positively and distinctly assured that the treaty when made would be supported by the constitutional majority of the Senate. This assurance came from the "only reliable quarter,"³ and dispelled from the mind of the President any apprehension that the question would require the interposition of the popular voice, and thus become an engine in the hands of unscrupulous political hucksters to create bad blood and excite evil dissensions. This action of the President puts the lie on those stupid and unfounded charges that pass for history with many, that the Texas question was started by Mr. Tyler with a view to a nomination in 1844. Having in the beginning of his administration, in view of the agitating question of the bank then before the Cabinet, submitted for their decision the propriety of his renouncing in his message all intention to appear as a candidate at the next election for President, and having been only dissuaded from taking this course by their unanimous disapproval of the proposition, he would have been overjoyed at the peaceable and speedy settlement of the question of annexation. Mr. Tyler says:

"No difficulty of serious moment stood in the way of a successful negotiation of the Texas treaty. It required only the assent of the Presidents of the two Republics to negotiate, and the work was all the same as done. The difficulty arose afterwards, and the people had to interpose their authority in order to crown the measure with success, an interposition the necessity for which, I must be permitted to say, had not been anticipated in the remotest degree—nay, had been actually guarded against by assurances from the only reliable quarter that the treaty when negotiated would be ratified by a constitutional majority of the Senate."³

The proposition of annexation was made, under the President's direction, by the Secretary of State, on the 16th of October, 1843, and its progress was confined to the knowledge of himself, the President, and the Minister, Mr. Van Zandt. Profound secrecy was enjoined, from the apprehension entertained by the President of a formal protest from Great Britain and France, which might have "involved consequences of serious import." When Congress met, as it did, in December, 1843, the Executive felt it his

duty, without disclosing the actual existence of a treaty, to call the attention of the Legislature, in his annual message, to the belligerent attitude of Mexico, and her cruel and uncivilized policy with regard to Texas. In this he referred to the American Minister's report of the threats made by Mexico in view of the rumored treaty. He said :

"The United States have an immediate interest in seeing an end put to the state of hostilities existing between Mexico and Texas. They are our neighbors of the same continent, with whom we are not only desirous of cultivating the relations of amity, but of the most extended commercial intercourse, and to practise all the rights of a neighborhood hospitality. Our own interests are involved in the matter ; since, however neutral may be our course of policy, we cannot hope to escape the effects of a spirit of jealousy on the part of both of the powers. Nor can this government be indifferent to the fact that a warfare such as is waged between those two nations is calculated to weaken both powers, and finally to render them—and especially the weaker of the two—the subjects of interference on the part of stronger and more powerful nations ; which, intent only on advancing their own peculiar views, may, sooner or later, attempt to bring about a compliance with terms, as the condition of their interposition, alike derogatory to the nation granting them, and detrimental to the interests of the United States. We could not be expected quietly to permit any such interference to our disadvantage. Considering that Texas is separated from the United States by a mere geographical line, that her territory, in the opinion of many, down to a late period formed a portion of the territory of the United States ; that it is homogeneous in its population and pursuits with the adjoining States, and makes contributions to the commerce of the world in the same articles with them ; and that most of her inhabitants have been citizens of the United States, speak the same language, and live under similar political institutions with ourselves ; this government is bound, by every consideration of interest, as well as of sympathy, to see that she shall be left free to act, especially in regard to her domestic affairs, unawed by force and unrestrained by the policy or views of other countries. In full view of all these facts the Executive has not hesitated to express to the government of Mexico how deeply it deprecated a continuance of the war, and how anxiously it desired to witness its termination. I cannot but think that it becomes the United States, as the oldest of American republics, to hold a language to Mexico upon this subject of an unambiguous character. It is time that this war had ceased. There must be a limit to all wars ; and if the parent State, after an eight years' struggle, has failed to reduce to submission a portion of its subjects standing out in revolt against it, and

who have not only proclaimed themselves to be independent, but have been recognized as such by other powers, she ought not to expect that other nations will quietly look, to their obvious injury, upon a protraction of hostilities. . . . While, therefore, the Executive would deplore any collision with Mexico, or any disturbance of the friendly relations which exist between the two countries, it cannot permit that government to control its policy, whatever it may be, to Texas; but will treat her—as by the recognition of her independence the United States long since declared they would do—as entirely independent of Mexico.”

In the mean time negotiations had received a temporary embarrassment due to the doubt of the Texas minister, Mr. Van Zandt, with regard to his having full power to complete the treaty. A special messenger was sent to Texas, and the government informed of the renewal of negotiations. President Houston seemed at first disposed to indulge in “coquetry” and “flirtation.” He apparently refused to open the question again, and did not respond at all favorably to the demand of Mr. Van Zandt till popular indignation forced him to think more favorably of the idea. The threatening posture of Mexico tended to embarrass the question somewhat further. A suspension of hostilities had existed between the countries for some time past, but active war was now threatened by Mexico on the inception of any treaty with the United States by Texas. In this state of affairs President Houston was loath to enter upon an act which would make Texas the object of immediate attack, and he demanded from our minister at Galveston, Gen. W. S. Murphy, the assurance of protection on the part of the United States. Gen. Murphy, with a zeal transcending his authority, gave the pledge as required of him, and Col. Henderson was deputed to travel to Washington and unite with Mr. Van Zandt in the consummation of the transaction. Col. Henderson went by St. Augustine, and his journey was necessarily slow. Before his arrival, however, a sad accident had deprived Mr. Upshur, Secretary of State, of life, and the negotiations, which he had prosecuted with so much intelligence and ability, were turned over to Mr. Nelson, who was appointed Secretary *ad interim*. On March 11th the President directed Mr. Nelson to reply to Gen. Murphy’s letter but lately received, in which he set forth the constitutional limitations of the executive power in the employment of the forces of the United States. At the same time he did not doubt that the Executive could give within the pale of the constitution a promise of protection after the signature of the treaty and while the same was pending before the Senate for ratification. When, therefore, Col. Henderson arrived and made the promise of protection a condition of the treaty’s consummation, the President considered it prudent

and constitutional to do as required. "It is due to myself," he said, "that I should declare it as my opinion that the United States having by the treaty of annexation acquired a title to Texas, which requires only the act of the Senate to perfect it, no other power could be permitted to invade, and by force of arms to possess itself of any portion of the territory of Texas, pending your deliberations upon the treaty, without placing itself in a hostile attitude to the United States, and justifying the employment of any means at my disposal to drive back the invasion."

Henry A. Wise, in his "Seven Decades of the Union," gives the story of the manner in which Mr. Calhoun came to succeed Mr. Upshur in the office of Secretary of State. The loss of two of his cabinet—Upshur and Gilmer—on board the ill-fated Princeton by the explosion of one of her great guns had filled the country with dismay, and the President with grief and anxious solicitude to fill their posts "with the best and most available talent the country could afford." Mr. Nelson was appointed Secretary *ad interim*, and the negotiations were only prevented from conclusion by the non-arrival of Col. Henderson. Indeed, Mr. Upshur had made the fair official copy of the treaty himself, with his own hand, to be signed by the high contracting parties. Prominent among the friends of annexation, both for his ability and the inveteracy of the antipathy entertained for him by the Van Buren faction of the Democracy and the Clay Whigs, stood John C. Calhoun. He had been for many years previous to 1840 in the ranks of the Opposition, but at this election he had returned to a new association with the Loco-focos, which, by creating new antagonism, redounded very little to his popularity. There were reasons to believe that many in the Senate, who had either expressly or impliedly promised their support of the treaty, would from motives of personal hostility to Mr. Calhoun oppose the measure in the event of his appointment as Secretary of State. Mr. Benton, who headed the Van Buren faction of the Democrats in the Senate, had been conciliated to the administration by the appointment of his son-in-law, John C. Fremont, as the "Pathfinder." Mr. Benton hated Mr. Calhoun, and looked upon him as a rival in the party. He liked Upshur, and would have supported him. Mr. Tyler knew this and believed that another agent might be selected who, if not as talented, might be more popular with the Senate. It was, therefore, not a little to his regret and mortification when his confidential friend, Mr. Wise, in the intensity of his impulsive nature and in the intensity of his admiration for Mr. Calhoun, took the liberty of offering to him, in the President's name, the vacant office of State. The President was thus placed between the two horns of a dilemma. No matter what course he might adopt, annexation was dangerously affected. His repudia-

tion of the hasty and inconsiderate act of his brave, brilliant, and devoted lieutenant—who, as captain of the corporal's guard, had dared the whole force of the Federalists and Loco-focos in his behalf—would offend all parties, Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Wise alike. There was no help for it, and Mr. Calhoun was confirmed by the Senate. Partially estranged from one another by reason of differences in regard to the election of 1840, "My letter," says Mr. Tyler, "inviting him to the cabinet informed him for the first time of the pending negotiations, the knowledge of which had been confined to Mr. Upshur, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Van Zandt, under injunctions of profound secrecy from the apprehensions of a formal protest from Great Britain and France, which might have involved consequences of serious import."

The treaty was signed April 12, 1844, the preliminaries having been fully completed by Messrs. Upshur and Nelson. Almost simultaneously with the act, in pursuance of the pledge, troops and naval forces were concentrated in the Gulf of Mexico, and a large military force at Fort Jesup on the borders of Texas. A messenger was likewise sent to Mexico in the person of Mr. Ben. E. Green—not to gain the consent of Mexico to the treaty, but to explain to that Government the motives with which this country had adopted the course pursued in forming it. He was directed to assure the Mexican Republic of the desire of the President to settle all questions which might grow out of the treaty on the most liberal terms; and finally, to express the cordial wish of this country to remain at peace and in friendship with Mexico.

On the 22d of April, 1844, the President sent the treaty to the Senate for ratification, accompanying it with an able and elaborate message. It was the signal for a violent explosion against the administration. The "previous assurances" of support were forgotten, and the crowd took the cue from the leaders. Never was the unpopularity of Mr. Calhoun more manifest, and it must be said never did any man adopt a more indiscreet course to obtain the adoption of a great measure. He could talk of nothing but the abolition designs of Great Britain, and their operation as affecting the existence of slavery in the United States. The question in his eyes was one simply of Southern interest, and hence was peculiarly liable to attack. His enemies saw their opportunity and availed themselves of it. Sectional spirit was excited, and the abolition devotees aroused to the highest pitch of frenzy. Politicians, like Mr. Clay, fought shy of a question so calculated to affect their interest, for good or bad, in the coming election, and considered, no doubt, that the best welfare of the Union should be sacrificed than that their own personal advancement should be neglected; while Mr.

Benton, looking to the succession, viewed it as a favorable opportunity to crush his old antagonist by placing the whole burden on his shoulders. Mr. Tyler, with that breadth of mind so characteristic of him on all questions of practical interest, took the only true statesmanlike position. In 1850 he expressed this position as follows, in a private letter to his son, Colonel Robert Tyler:

"Mr. Webster has sent me his speech on the slavery question in pamphlet with expressions of 'cordial friendship.' I have replied in a brief letter, putting him right on the subject of Texas annexation. My view of that subject was not narrow, local, or bigoted. It embraced the whole country and all its interests. The monopoly of the cotton plant was the great and important concern. That monopoly, now secured, places all other nations at our feet. An embargo of a single year would produce in Europe a greater amount of suffering than a fifty years' war. I doubt whether Great Britain could avoid convulsions. And yet, with these results before him, Mr. Calhoun unceasingly talked of slavery and its abolition in connection with the subject. That idea seemed to possess him and Upshur *as a single idea*. They are gone to their long homes, and have left but few equals behind in all that is calculated to exalt the character of man. But I do but justice to myself in declaring that my views extended to the great interests of the country and were not confined to a single interest."

Such were the views of Mr. Tyler, and they are alike honorable to himself and to the country. The patriot must sigh that the views of statesmen have not been always as broad on questions affecting the integrity and the best welfare of the Union. Too often they have condescended to trickery and knavishness, in which all things worthy of estimation have been made the sacrifice to hydra-headed selfishness.

The question of annexation acted as a bomb exploding suddenly in the midst of a quiet neighborhood. Two days before the submission of the treaty, Mr. Tyler wrote: "Parties are violently agitated, Clay will most probably come out against Texas. If so, he is a doomed man, and then Van will seek to come in on Texas and my vetoes. For that we are ready to do battle."

Mr. Clay did come out in a few days after in a letter avowing his opposition to annexation, and Mr. Van Buren, having been adroitly questioned, did the same by disclaiming the very platform that might have saved him. He was for annexation when it could be "peaceably" accomplished, but deprecated the scheme without the consent of Mexico. Mr. Van Buren had his eye on policy, and, shrewd and wily as he was, he counted for once without his host. Sure, at that time, of a majority of delegates in the nom-

inating convention, which was to meet on the 27th of May, he thought that nothing could be gained while much might be lost by espousing annexation. Confident of a nomination, he believed that in refusing to commit himself to the measure his case would be no worse off than that of Mr. Clay, his antagonist, on that point. The letters of Mr. Clay and Mr. Van Buren put the "spoils" Loco-foco faction of 1840, and the treacherous National Republicans—Whigs, so-called—of 1841, completely within the power of Mr. Tyler. A large element of the Democratic party was in favor of annexation. It consisted, in main, of that strict construction element which, in following Mr. Calhoun back to the Democratic name in 1840, were adverse to Mr. Van Buren as a man, but believed in the hard money idea of the Sub-Treasury. The question of annexation afforded an opportunity of the union of the strict-constructionists, both Whig and Democratic, so-called, a union which had been disrupted by the rise of Van Burenism, which, professing Jeffersonian principles, went to the extreme of centralism. The union of these two elements afforded the hope of the repudiation of Loco-focoism and the restoration of the true Democratic party of 1828. Mr. Tyler thus tells the tale in a confidential letter published in the *Atlantic Monthly* for November, 1880:

"Texas was the great theme that occupied me. The delegates to the Democratic Convention, or a very large majority of them, had been elected under implied pledges to sustain Van Buren. After his letter repudiating annexation a revulsion had become obvious, but how far it was to operate it was not possible to say. A majority of the delegates, at least, were believed still to remain in his favor. If he was nominated the game to be played for Texas was all as one over. What was to be done?

"My friends advised me to remain at rest, and take my chances in the Democratic Convention. It was impossible to do so. If I suffered my name to be used in that Convention, then I became bound to sustain the nomination, even if Mr. Van Buren were the nominee. This could not be. I chose to run no hazard, but to raise the banner of Texas and convoke my friends to sustain it. To my surprise, the notice which was thus issued brought together a thousand delegates, and from every State in the Union. Many called on me on their way to Baltimore to receive my views. My instructions were: 'Go to Baltimore, make your nomination, and then go home and leave the thing to work its own results.' I said no more, and was obeyed. A Texas man or defeat was the choice left—and they took a Texas man. My withdrawal at a suitable time took place, and the result was soon before the world. I acted to insure the success of a great measure, and I acted not altogether without effect. In so doing I kept my

own secrets. To have divulged them would have been to have defeated them."

The Whig Convention had met on May 1st, shortly after Mr. Clay's letter, and nominated its writer. Blind to the future, he was a doomed man, indeed; for the floods were gathering around him, guided by the hand of the man whom he had betrayed and proposed to "drive." The Democratic Convention met in Baltimore on May 27th, and at the same time and place the friends of Mr. Tyler held their Convention. The Democrats, alarmed at this manifestation, which threatened wholesale desertion from their ranks, hastily abandoned Mr. Van Buren, and nominated, in the person of James K. Polk, a man committed to the cause of annexation. The grip of Loco-focoism was released from the throat of the Democratic party, and it rose strong and mighty in the general union of the Jeffersonian elements of the country.

A few days after, the Senate voted upon the question of ratification of the treaty, and, as might have been expected from the condition of politics, with Mr. Clay and Mr. Van Buren both opposed, and Mr. Calhoun raving about slavery and thus exciting distrust in the Northern mind, and interested rivals in the Democratic ranks, like Mr. Benton, charging a deep-laid disunion conspiracy upon the Secretary of State in order to crush him, the treaty failed of the requisite vote. Mr. McDuffie, of South Carolina, who had eloquently defended it, compared it to the slain Cæsar whose spectre would yet meet its murderers as the spectre of the betrayed Roman met Brutus at Philippi. Indeed the politicians had reason

"To fear it all the more
For lying there so still,
There was manhood in its look,
That murder could not kill."

The alternative which the President had deprecated had forced itself upon the administration, and the appeal was to be made to the people. Two days after the vote in the Senate the President laid the treaty and all accompanying documents before the House of Representatives. The people, to whom the appeal had now been made, were represented more directly in the House, and it was proper and right that the treaty involving a question of such magnitude should be acted upon by their immediate representatives. He suggested in his message that while he regarded annexation to be accomplished by treaty as the most suitable form in which it could be effected, that he would stand "ready to yield his prompt and active co-operation if Con-

gress deemed it proper to resort to any other expedient compatible with the Constitution." This was on June 10, 1844. The message was referred by the House to its Committee on Foreign Relations, but before it could report the House adjourned, and so its action was carried over to the next session, to await the decision of the popular vote.

Mr. Calhoun had on hand the Oregon treaty as well. Mr. Tyler states that on the rejection of the Texas treaty "there was cause, in the opinion of Mr. Calhoun, to pause in any further effort at negotiation on any other subject." To this, however, the President would not listen. He was exceedingly "desirous of closing his residence in Washington by the consolidation of the peace between the two countries through the adjustment of the only open question of moment existing at that day between them. The same patriotic envoy, Mr. Everett, was still in London, and had placed the Government in possession of the terms on which Great Britain would be inclined to settle the question." Mr. Calhoun "was rallied back to the task, and probably opened the way to that sequel which developed itself under Mr. Polk's administration."

While Loco-focoism, which had so perverted the character of the Democratic party since 1833, was venting its impotent rage in the invectives of Mr. Benton in the Senate, in the intrigues of Mr. Van Buren for the presidency, and in the sputter of Mr. Blair from the editorial tripod of the *Globe*, General Jackson in his retirement, whose impulses were always honorable, whatever might be said of the obstinacy and weakness of his judgment, had shaken off the folds of the slimy monster which had so long used him as it desired, and come out with dying voice in favor of the admission of Texas into the Union. The expiring fires of life seemed in his case to be suddenly awakened into a bright and glowing flame to light his countrymen along the path of safety and of duty. He saw that the "golden moment" had arrived when Texas was either to be secured or lost forever, and he nobly assisted in causing that great rally of the people which well nigh trampled into dust all who had the temerity to resist it. Mr. Tyler had accomplished the great end for which he had worked. The democracy had thrown the magic banner of Texas to the breeze, and it remained only for him to withdraw and unite his forces with that of this party to carry rout and ruin into the ranks of all his enemies. Black and threatening rose the clouds upon the horizon, and "he rode upon the whirlwind and directed the storm." In August Mr. Tyler publicly withdrew, and, henceforth, the cause was fully consolidated. General Jackson, who had taken Mr. Polk under his wing, despatched the following letter of thanks to Mr. Sutherland:

The Honble. J. B. Sutherland,

(Private.)

HERMITAGE, Sept. 2, 1844.

DEAR SIR: Your private letter of the 20th ultimo has been received, and I have read it with pleasure. The withdrawal of Mr. Tyler from the canvass will be duly appreciated by all the Jeffersonian Republicans, and in the end redound to his popularity and free him from all selfish views which his enemies have been imputing to him in his patriotic endeavors to reannex Texas to the United States—the most important question, as it relates to the defence, the security, and safety of the most important interests of the whole Union that has ever been presented to us. It is a great national, and not a party question.

As requested, I have enclosed your letter to Col. Polk, and enclose you a lock of my hair.

Very respectfully yrs., &c., &c.,

ANDREW JACKSON.

In the interval between Mr. Tyler's withdrawal and the day of election in November, the caldron of politics seethed nothing but Texas! Texas! The excitement intensified with the approach of the battle-hour. At length the day arrived. Between the embattled hosts shone the drawn sword of the Administration with Texas inscribed upon its blade, and wielded by a hand that never trembled in moment of danger. Its very shadow, like that of the magic sword of eastern fable, seemed death. Mr. Clay threw himself upon its point, and was laid forever aside in the vault which disappointment has prepared for reckless and ambitious politicians. Mr. Van Buren felt that sword's shadow, and was laid by the side of his old antagonist. Mr. Benton, who thought to come in after Mr. Van Buren, and who also wished to ride the Texas question, received a mortal wound which threw him into a decline from which he could never recover; and, finally, Mr. F. P. Blair, the obedient servitor of both, soon toppled off the tripod of the *Globe* under the same fatal influence. Never did any President win so great a victory!

But the end was not yet. When Congress met at its second session, December 3, 1844, the friends of annexation were jubilant. The voice of the people had been heard, and men were anxious to yield implicit obedience to its mandates. Acting on the suggestions contained in the President's message, Mr. Milton Brown, of Tennessee, a strict construction Whig, proposed the celebrated joint resolutions for the admission of Texas. After a considerable opposition from the slavery restrictionists, the resolutions of Mr. Brown passed the House on the 22d of January, 1845. "Rejoice with me," wrote the President, "in the passage of a bill for annexing Texas to the Union, through the House, by a majority of 22 votes. I entertain strong hopes that it will pass the Senate. A greater triumph was never achieved than that already accomplished!"

In the Senate, Mr. Benton had proposed a bill of his own, proposing the appointment of commissioners by the President who should treat with

Texas upon terms of annexation—a measure very lame and impotent, requiring great delay, the expenditure of a hundred thousand dollars, and, as resulting in a new treaty, necessitating a further submission to the Senate, where it would have to obtain a two-thirds vote in accordance with the constitutional requirement. Mr. Benton and four other Loco-focos refused to agree to the House resolutions, whereupon Mr. Walker, of Mississippi, proposed to unite the two propositions, adding a clause giving the Executive power to choose between the two. It was now within a short period of the close of Mr. Tyler's term. Mr. Polk had arrived, and his contiguity and the brief interval between the vote on the bill and his accession, as well as the popular pressure brought to bear upon the unwilling Senators, made them more pliant and disposed to vote for the bill. The bill came up on March 1, 1845, and passed the Senate, Mr. Benton and his friends voting in the affirmative. The President, of course, chose the House proposition and immediately despatched a messenger to Texas with the announcement of the fact of annexation.

Mr. Benton has declared that he and four of his friends were cheated out of their votes, assigning as the only ground of the charge some impulsive expression of Mr. McDuffie, and some pointless remark of Mr. Walker—both utterances, however, even if true, confessed by him as without any known authority from either the President or Mr. Calhoun, who were responsible for neither one remark nor the other. Their voting for the bill, as Mr. Tyler states, consisted in a simple act of "inadvertence" on their part. But Mr. Benton did not seem to think that if he and his four friends might claim to have been cheated out of their votes, others, constituting a much larger number, might prefer as serious a charge against himself, and with far greater justice according to his own statement of the matter in his "Thirty Years' View"—a book that contains as many inaccuracies, and as much vindictiveness as could be put together conveniently. Mr. Calhoun states "that it was known that Mr. Benton's resolutions were never considered as expressing the deliberate sense of the House or the Senate, but were moved simply to gratify him and his friends, as they had the power to embarrass very greatly the passage of the bill." Yet Mr. Benton admits that, expecting Mr. Polk to pass upon the alternative propositions, he got him to promise beforehand to select the bill of Mr. Benton. This was not only a very blamable intrigue, but one in which the attempt was made to destroy the freedom of choice allowed in the bill itself, as well as to cheat the majority out of their votes. I copy from a manuscript of Mr. Tyler the following satisfactory statement in regard to the charge of indelicacy to Mr. Polk in forestalling his choice:

"It is due to truth to say that a momentary pause preceded my selection between the alternative resolutions of Congress, resulting solely from an apprehension of making myself obnoxious to the charge of a want of delicacy to my successor. That was the only point on which a doubt rested in my mind. As to the choice between the alternative resolutions, I wanted no suggestion, no advice, no counsel. The only doubt, I repeat, rested on the question of delicacy. After conference with the Secretary of State, in which he advised a prompt decision along with reasons to dispel that doubt, I directed that the cabinet should be summoned for the following day, with the view to submit the whole matter to their consideration. There existed upon this occasion no divided counsels, no dissonance of opinion. The Executive was fully apprised of the extraordinary exertions which were making by other persons to induce Texas to negative annexation, and as some time might elapse before the incoming administration could make itself acquainted thoroughly with the posture of affairs, it was considered proper and altogether necessary to hazard nothing by delicacy. The apparent point of delicacy was saved by the tender of a full explanation of all that was done to Mr. Polk, who was waited on at my request by the Secretary in person, and with a declaration of readiness to submit to him the instructions prepared for the minister in Texas. Mr. Polk declined any interference in the matter. The instructions were prepared by the Secretary of State, received my approval, and thus closed the last chapter of my connection with Texas annexation."

Never were men more thoroughly embittered by the annexation of Texas than the Van Buren Loco-focos. Mr. Polk, disgusted at the action of Mr. Blair and the *Globe*, refused to bestow upon it the Government patronage, and withdrew the support of the party. The result was the discontinuance of the paper and the prostration of Mr. Blair. Mr. Benton and he could talk of nothing but a grand conspiracy, in which Mr. Calhoun, as the rival of Mr. Benton, figured conspicuously, having for its object a rupture of the Union in annexing Texas, the setting up of a Southern confederacy, the extension of slavery and presidential intrigue. According to this wonderful story Mr. Calhoun had been the beginning and end of Texas annexation, and through all its ramifications he had been the dark and mysterious spirit which had nursed it to its final consummation. The design was too patent. Mr. Calhoun had a large Southern following, and it was hoped, by making him responsible for the acts of the administration, that his ruin must follow. Mr. Tyler belonged to no party, stood apparently isolated among his small band of friends, and his power was not to be apprehended in the Presidential race. Hence they affected to ignore him and bring Mr.

Calhoun into prominence. They however failed signally, for the President developed great strength on the Texas question, and had things his own way. He was a man, indeed, of singular independence of judgment, and on practical questions always right. Witness his independent course on the Force bill, in 1833, when he voted alone against a measure tending to bloodshed before every available means of pacification, as appeared afterward, had been resorted to; witness, too, his separation from his colleague on the question of resignation at the time of the famous expunging resolutions of Mr. Benton; and, above all, witness his maintaining his individuality against all the arts of his Federal cabinet and of the Clay Whigs on the bank question. Mr. Tyler was absolutely and unequivocally the head of his cabinet. He exacted the utmost deference from them, and they dared not to do otherwise than pay the utmost respect to his wishes. Thus the Ashburton Treaty—the merit of which has been imputed to Mr. Webster—was concluded only after repeated conferences with him, and finally, after agreement, “the letters were each submitted to me and received my correction.”⁸ The same influences were at work with regard to the exaltation of Mr. Webster, when he was Secretary of State, as existed when Mr. Calhoun filled the chair. He stood at the head of a considerable following, and he was supposed to be a lion in the path to the presidency, whom it was necessary to destroy. Mr. Tyler wrote the following letter to his son, on the occasion of a revival of the questions growing out of Texas annexation by Mr. Blair, in 1856:

“I have read ‘Blair’s Dreams’ with mingled feelings of contempt and amusement—contempt for the puerile weakness of the egotist, and amusement at the deeply laid plots and intrigues for the destruction of F. P. Blair, concocted and urged by so very many persons. He is so wrapped up in his own importance that he does not see that he wrote his own epitaph before Mr. Polk had become a nominee for the Presidency. He opposed the Ashburton Treaty and the annexation of Texas. If the first disturbed him in his position the last sealed his fate. The most ludicrous part of the business is that he gives publicity to Gen. Jackson’s letters to him, written in great confidence, and in the last hours of his existence (letters, by the way, which for the fame’s sake of Gen. Jackson should never have been published), when he disregarded altogether the advice and pressing appeals of the General constantly urged upon the public in favor of annexation. In urging upon the *Calhoun-Tyler administration* a conspiracy against the Union, with what grace has he omitted all implication of Gen. Jackson in the conspiracy. The idea that Calhoun had anything to do with originating the measure is as absurd as it is designed to be wicked. I ex-

changed no political views with Calhoun at all until he became a member of the cabinet, and, at the time of my directing Upshur to enter upon the negotiation, Calhoun was in private life. The knowledge of what was designed was confined to Upshur, Nelson, and Van Zandt; and if Van Zandt had possessed powers to negotiate the treaty would have been negotiated in a week; and, furthermore, if Gen. Henderson had reached the city before Calhoun, John Nelson, the Secretary *ad interim*, would have concluded the matter. Calhoun reached before Henderson, and, therefore, did what Upshur and Nelson would have done as well. As to the convention in Baltimore, you know that Calhoun had no more to do with it than a man in Kamtchatka, and to any intrigue with Polk about the *Globe*, that is merely the old tale of John C. Rives, in his controversy with Mr. Ritchie, revamped for the occasion. I put the matter effectually to rest at that day, and shall hardly trouble myself about it again. I do not believe that the world ever saw a more perfectly unprincipled set than that which surrounded Jackson at Washington. But the survivors of them cannot fret me, and shall not disturb me; and I leave Blair and all his tribe to lament over their downfall without interfering with their sorrow."

The charge of Mr. Calhoun's inception of the treaty and his authorship of it was made by Mr. Benton in the Mexican war in a speech, wherein he attempted to fasten the responsibility of the war on Mr. Calhoun, who had grown to be very unpopular. Mr. Calhoun's human weakness was not proof against the assault. He could assume, he thought, with grace, what was intended as a reproach. His vanity was interested, and the authorship of annexation was a tempting prize. He confessed, however, with reference to the motives of Mr. Benton: "Had he supposed the opposite, had he believed the war was necessary and unavoidable and that its termination would be successful, I am the last man to whom he would attribute any agency in causing it."

Mr. Tyler was justly indignant at this egotism of Mr. Calhoun, and his letter to his son at this period shows his real sentiments:

"Calhoun has confirmed his character for extreme selfishness by his speech on the war. Benton sought, through C.'s unpopularity, to re-establish himself on the ground he had lost in the election of 1844 by ascribing everything to Calhoun, and the latter was weak enough to swallow the bait. I am strongly tempted to give a full history of the whole affair. He represents the executive power as in abeyance, when in fact it was most active—and then to cause the whole question to turn on the question of slavery! It is too bad."

It was too bad. The course of Calhoun was followed by others in the Democratic party, all claiming a more or less intimate connection with an-

nexation, and all attempting to belittle Mr. Tyler's influence in the matter. His "thunder" was stolen to make party capital, and it cannot be saying too much that Texas annexation controlled the character of the elections up to 1860. Mr. Tyler writes at this period :

"There was speaking here yesterday and last night amid the severest storm of wind that I have witnessed for years. Segar is a candidate for the Legislature and will vote for Letcher. A new convert. I saw him with others at the P. office in Hampton a day or two ago, and he expressed a desire to be deputed to the Charleston Convention, 'that he might do justice,' as he expressed it, 'to John Tyler.' He was a bitter opponent all along. The Texas question is again revived, and his vote against it is urged as one of the most formidable objections to Goggin. He seeks to escape upon the ground that the boundaries were not defined. So we go. My thunder is still used to achieve victory by the Democrats."

The President's thunder was accompanied by lightning as well, and we have seen how it prostrated the politicians of 1845. It was the consummation of his vengeance on all his old vindictive adversaries. What folly in Mr. Blaine to speak in his late Garfield Memorial address of the unparalleled triumph of Mr. Clay in taking away from the President the party which had elected him, and his obliging him to seek shelter behind the lines of his old political foes. Mr. Clay in raising the banner of a bank contrary to his pledges of compromise simply, as explained elsewhere, repossessed himself of his old following. They were his already. Then as to Mr. Tyler's seeking shelter behind the lines of his political foes, the fact is the Van Buren faction were as bitter toward him as the Whigs. The party in repudiating the lead of the "spoils" clique returned once more to the principles of Jefferson, which Mr. Tyler had ever adored, and gave him a support only so far as they could not help themselves. Indeed, Mr. Clay's action was so perfectly the reverse of a triumph in its fruits that it only served, after disappointing him in all his grand schemes and forcing his resignation, to add glory to Mr. Tyler and to destroy himself. To the Loco-focos the blow was irremediable. The charm of their influence was lost forever upon the strict construction party. Each of the leaders halted at last in avowed consolidation, latitudinarianism, and nationalism—their proper destiny. Mr. Blair became an open Republican in 1856, Mr. Benton was repudiated by his constituents in Missouri, and Mr. Van Buren joined the Freesoil party. So with the rest.

Mr. Tyler vehemently denied, as we have seen, the interpretation of slavery as sought to be imposed upon annexation by Mr. Calhoun and others. I copy from his manuscript again :

"I was actuated by no mere sectional consideration whether slavery was to be extended over the territory of Texas or not. This problem was soluble in my view by reference to climate, the true exponent of that question, and the terms of the Missouri compromise, which in itself is but a recognition of the law of climate, which should be regarded by Congress, considering the circumstances under which that compromise was adopted as equal in obligation to the fundamental law. No; so far as my agency in the matter extended I looked to the interests of the whole Union. The acquisition of Texas gave to the United States a monopoly of the cotton plant, and thus secured to us a power of boundless extent in the affairs of the world. It opened at the same time to the inhabitants of our whole country sources of immense wealth, which a few years only will develop. When the Gulf of Mexico shall be whitened by the sail of innumerable ships and vessels engaged in the coast-wise and foreign trade bearing to Texas the products of the skill and industry of all the other sections of the Union to be exchanged for the valuable products of her fertile soil there will be but one sentiment throughout the land on this important subject, and this will be that Texas annexation *was a national and not a local, an American and not a Southern question.*"

When Mr. Tyler spoke these words he looked through the dust and smoke of the Mexican war, when that war had become an unpopular affair, and when, through its unpopularity, the attempt was being made to degrade the effects of annexation in the public mind. The smoke of that war has long since blown aside, and with it have disappeared the prejudices and passions of the times. The resources of Texas have been a thousandfold developed. Her population has grown from 200,000 to 1,592,574. The Gulf of Mexico bears upon its passionate breast the countless argosies of white-winged commerce. To-day the patriot, looking over the results of annexation, and viewing not only the broad empire of Texas with her exhaustless soil, but also the far-reaching prairies of New Mexico, and the golden shores of California, is forced to recognize the fact that the time has already come to which Mr. Tyler looked forward with so much confidence. There is but one sentiment throughout the land, and that is that the question of Texas annexation was one of undoubted national and American significance!

Thus closed the administration of Mr. Tyler. With a light heart he returned to private life, looking back with a proud consciousness over the great field of his four years' service. For without a party's aid, and depending only upon the support of great and virtuous men, a Webster, an Upshur, a Legaré, a Gilmer, a Spencer, a Wise, and a Calhoun, he could point to the colossal monuments of the Northeastern Boundary question,

embarrassed by fifty years' entanglements, forever and honorably settled; the Oregon line mapped out for his successor; the first treaty with China accomplished; the present naval system, as developed under its various bureaus, proposed and established; science and invention, under the lead of Morse, cherished and fostered; the expenses of the Government reduced nearly one-fourth in contrast with the preceding administration, constituting in this respect a solitary exception to all other administrations; a treasury brought from the throes of financial embarrassment to redundant coffers, with not a dollar lost in all the disbursements; and finally a Texas added to stretch the line of our power and territory! If success is to be measured by simple party popularity, Mr. Tyler's term was unsuccessful; but if, as it should be, success is to be attributed to the importance of the results achieved, what administration, from Washington's down, can compare with it?

The joy succeeding in Texas on receipt of the good news was immense. The ex-President received, among other testimonials from the people of that now powerful State, a silver pitcher suitably inscribed and engraved. In a letter written to Mr. Tyler in 1851 by Colonel John S. Cunningham, now paymaster of the United States Navy, I find the following:

"In the course of a chat with Sam Houston, in the Senate Chamber, I mentioned your silver pitcher from the ladies of Brazoria. He replied: 'This was intended as a hit at me!' and then added that for all his military and civil triumphs he was never honored in Texas with a present. 'Nor,' said he, 'can there be found on the records a single vote of thanks or the like of any sort.' He requested me to say to you that he held you in high esteem, and that if you should ever visit Texas, whose people regard you with reverence, you would be received with glorious warmth, and that he himself would go down to the seashore and make you the welcome speech. One of the counties is named after you, and the seat of another county."

LYON GARDINER TYLER

¹ Henry A. Wise's *Seven Decades of the Union*, p. 169.

² Dead of the Cabinet. Address of Mr. Tyler at Petersburg, Va., 1856.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Special Message to the Senate, May 15, 1844.

⁵ Private letter of President Tyler.

⁶ Dead, of the Cabinet.

⁷ The parallel of 49° was ultimately agreed upon as the basis of settlement of the Oregon Question. Mr. Everett had been instructed by Mr. Tyler to sound Great Britain upon that line.—*Private letter.*

⁸ Private letter to Col. Robert Tyler.

⁹ Speech of Mr. Calhoun in the Senate, February 24, 1847.

NOTES.

On the return of Mr. Clay to the Senate, in 1849, when, through a split in the Democratic party, the Whig party succeeded to power in the election of General Taylor, Mr. Tyler wrote:

"I hail Clay's return to the Senate with pleasure. He will rule or ruin. My only fear is that he will be quieted by a promise of the succession. This alone will keep him quiet. I might have bought my peace in that way, and so may General Taylor. If the break occurs, I shall triumph in a counter-current of public sentiment." (Private letter dated February 21, 1849.)

"You have heard, no doubt, of the terrible occurrence on board the Princeton, together with all the particulars. A more heartrending scene scarcely ever occurred. What a loss I have sustained in Upshur and Gilmer. They were truly my friends, and would have aided me for the next twelve months with great effect. But it is all over now, and I must look out for new Cabinet Ministers. My great desire will be to bring in as able men as the country can afford. I shall determine upon them in the course of the week." (Private letter of President Tyler to his daughter, March 4, 1844.)

THE EXPLOSION ON THE PRINCETON.—The following account is condensed from the editorial correspondence of *The Times*, dated February 28, 1844: Captain Stockton, of the steamer Princeton, to-day invited President Tyler and his family, together with three or four hundred ladies and gentlemen, including members of the Cabinet, Foreign Ministers, Senators and members of the Lower House, to make an excursion down the Potomac and witness the movements of his noble vessel, together with the practice of his great gun. The day was pleasant and everything promised a delightful trip. After a salute of twenty-one guns from the small pieces, the great gun was made ready for firing a two hundred and thirty pound ball. The ladies were all "piped on deck," and obtained good places to witness the discharge. At the word "fire!" all eyes were directed to the course of the ball, which bounded along the surface of the water a distance of two miles, to the delight of all. A feast followed and toasts sparkled with the champagne. On the return trip, about three miles below Mount Vernon, this great gun, called the "Peacemaker," and made in New York, was fired again, when it exploded, killing Mr. Upshur, Secretary of State, Mr. Gilmer, Secretary of the Navy, Commodore Kennon, and others, and seriously wounding Commodore Stockton. One person said, "When the accident happened, I was in the cabin listening to a patriotic song from one of the company, and as he was singing the word Washington, the gun fired, and said one of the gentlemen, 'there goes the Big Gun in honor of his name, let us also give three cheers to it'—but the cheering hardly commenced before the fatal event was made known and all were silent as death." Judge Wilkins was saved by a witticism. He had taken his stand by Mr. Gilmer, but perceiving that the gun was about to be fired, exclaimed, "Though Secretary of War I don't like this firing, and believe I shall run." He retreated, smiling, and thus saved his life. It was considered singular that not one of the two hundred ladies on board was injured. Returning from the funeral of the members of his Cabinet, President Tyler's horses ran away, and put him in danger of his life.

JOSHUA FORMAN, THE FOUNDER OF SYRACUSE

The name of Joshua Forman will always be intimately associated with the history of our country, in consequence of his connection with the Erie Canal and the banking system called the "Safety Fund Act," during the administration of Martin Van Buren as Governor of the State of New York, which subsequently became a law in this State, and in 1860 was adopted by the general government, being now in general use.

For twenty-five years this distinguished man was a leader in the affairs of Onondaga County, and, to quote Mr. Thurlow Weed, was the "*inventor* of the city of Syracuse."

Joshua Forman was born at Pleasant Valley, Dutchess County, N. Y., in 1777. His father, Deacon Joseph Forman, was from Monmouth County, N. J., and of the same family as Major-General Forman of Revolutionary fame, who was nicknamed "Black David," on account of his swarthy complexion and black beard. The Monmouth Formans came to this country from Holland a century and a half ago, and their descendants have married into many notable families, such as the Kearney, Hallet, Remsen, Hendrickson, Randolph, Du Bois, Throckmorton, Fréneau, Conover, Ledyard, Seymour, Graves, Leavenworth, and Sabine, of New Jersey and New York. The father of the subject of this sketch was a merchant in New York previous to the Revolution, and there married Miss Hannah Ward. On the approach of the British to the city, they removed to Dutchess County. Joshua was their second or third son. Evincing a strong desire for learning, he entered Union College at Schenectady. At the completion of his collegiate course, he studied law with Peter Radcliff, Esq., at Poughkeepsie, and afterward in the office of Miles Hopkins, Esq., of New York City. Very soon after completing his professional studies, he married Miss Margaret Alexander, a daughter of Boyd Alexander, M. P. for Glasgow, Scotland, a lady of great beauty, wit, and many accomplishments, who came to this country to visit a friend. She met Mr. Forman under romantic circumstances, and their union speedily followed. In 1800 the young couple removed from New York City to a pretty village then called Onondaga Hollow, now Onondaga Valley, where Mr. Forman established himself in the practice of the law.

The country was newly settled, the village flourishing, and Joshua Forman induced his father, brothers, and sisters to remove thither. William H. Sabine, Esq., a graduate of Brown University, Rhode Island, about this

time came from Pomfret, Conn., to the Hollow, and marrying Miss Sallie Forman, the sister of Joshua Forman, the two young lawyers went into partnership in 1803. For many years they had a lucrative practice, each building a fine residence, and becoming widely known in that part of the State. Through their united efforts the Onondaga Academy, a flourishing institution, was established, and the first religious society in Onondaga County—a Presbyterian—was founded. At the time of the organization of the Common Pleas Court, Mr. Forman was appointed Judge, and for ten years filled the office with marked ability.

Soon after Judge Forman became a resident of Onondaga County, the subject of building a canal from Albany to Lake Ontario, and improving the facilities of navigation in the interior of the State, was a topic of deep interest to all classes, and to none more than himself. He conversed with his friends on the subject, and it seemed to fill his thoughts. With the assistance of some kindred spirits he took measures to bring it before the public. His talents as an orator and his persuasive manner were so well known that he was selected as being eminently fitted to move in this matter. With this view, in 1807, a union ticket was gotten up for members of the Assembly, containing the names of John McWhorter, Democrat, and Joshua Forman, Federalist. It was called the Canal Ticket, and received the support of the majority of the Onondaga County voters.

It appears that while we were still but a colony of Great Britain the subject of improving the water-courses between the lakes and the Hudson had attracted much attention here and in England.

General Washington's interest in the same matter was evinced immediately after, or during the Revolution, by some letters written to various persons on that subject. In 1791 Governor Clinton, in his speech in the Legislature, urged the necessity of improving the natural water channels so as to facilitate communication with the frontier settlements. In 1792 the Legislature passed an act incorporating the "Western Inland Lock Navigation Company," with power to open a lock navigation from the Hudson to lakes Ontario and Seneca. This company was a failure, and the friends of the canal project in the interior and western part of the State were utterly discouraged.

Joshua Forman had studied the subject of canals, as constructed in foreign countries, when he was elected to the Assembly, but it seems that, in reading Rees' "Cyclopædia," some new ideas were suggested to his mind, immediately after reaching Albany, regarding the route of a canal through the State of New York. Years later, when David Hosack, M.D., wrote a life of DeWitt Clinton, he asked Judge Forman to give his own version of

his presentation of his canal project to the Legislature, and the following is a copy of the letter in reply to this request :

FRANKLIN, N. J., Oct. 13, 1828.

DEAR SIR :

On taking my seat in the Assembly for the County of Onondaga, at the Session of 1807-1808, my book-seller handed me several numbers of Rees' "Cyclopædia." In reading at my leisure, in the article "Canal," an account of the numerous canals and improved river navigation in England, I soon discovered the relative importance of the former over the latter. It occurred to me that, if a canal was ever opened from the Hudson to the Western lakes, it would be worth all the extra cost to go directly through the country to Lake Erie. I broached this subject to my room-mates, Judge Wright and General McNiel. Judge Wright at first objected, said it would be a folly to make a canal 150 miles long abreast of a good sloop navigation to Lake Ontario. To this I replied that the rich country through which it would pass, would, of itself, support a canal. Judge Wright gave in to the plan, agreed it was of immense importance, and measures ought at once to be taken to ascertain its practicability. I drew up the resolution, and presented it to the House. This resolution was adopted on the ground, as expressed by several, "that it could do no harm and might do some good." Shortly after, being in New York on business, and much elated with the result of the surveys that had been made by Judge Geddes, proving the practicability of the route suggested by me, I made a trip to Washington, almost entirely to converse with Jefferson on the subject. Some time in June, 1809, I called on him in company with Wm. Kirkpatrick, Esq., of Salina, then a Member of Congress, who introduced me, and informed him that, in view of his proposal to expend the surplus revenues of the nation in making roads and canals, the State of New York had explored the route of a canal from the Hudson River to Lake Erie, and had found it practicable beyond their most sanguine expectations, etc. He replied, "it was a fine project, and might be executed a century hence." I replied, that having conceived the idea, ascertained its practicability, and, in some measure, appreciated its importance, I thought the State of New York would never rest until it was accomplished. Now I do most solemnly declare, that the idea of a direct canal between the Hudson and Lake Erie was original with me, whoever else had thought of it before, that I had never heard of Gouverneur Morris's suggestions nor of Mr. Halsey's essays ; that, when it was broached to Judge Wright, he then and always said it was entirely new to him ; that, when it came into the House, it was treated as new and visionary for several years. I was called a "visionary projector," and have been asked hundreds of times, if I expected to see my canal completed, to which I uniformly replied, "as surely as I lived to the ordinary age of man." I never claimed to be the first man who thought of it, but to be the first man who conceived the idea, appreciated its importance, and set about carrying it into effect ; and, by the happy expedient of moving the eyes of the Legislature to the general Government for its accomplishment, induced them to make the first steps in a project too gigantic for them to have looked at a moment as an object to be accomplished by the means of the State.

TO DAVID HOSACK, M.D.

Respectfully yours,
(Signed) JOSHUA FORMAN.

A letter written by Judge Wright to Dr. Hosack, and published in the work above alluded to, is pertinent here. It is, in part, as follows :

NEW YORK, Dec. 31, 1828.

DR. HOSACK,

DEAR SIR : Judge Forman and myself, in 1808, roomed together in Albany, he being a Member of the Legislature from Onondaga County, and I from Oneida County. We were subscribers to Rees' "Cyclopædia," and received that winter the 6th vol. containing the article "Canal." Judge

Forman observed, after reading it, that something ought to be done to prevent the people of Pennsylvania from drawing away the trade of our State; and suggested that, as the President, Thomas Jefferson, had recommended the surplus money in the Treasury be expended on roads and canals, he was for the making a canal to Lake Erie. He accordingly introduced the resolution to the Legislature, and I seconded it. I well remember the astonishment of many members, who considered it a wild and visionary project," etc.

Thus from Judge Forman's letter to Dr. Hosack we find that he claimed the idea of a direct route for a canal through the State of New York to unite the waters of the Hudson with those of Lake Erie as original with him, and that his intimate friend, Judge Wright, was of the same opinion. This distinction has been claimed also for Governor Morris and Mr. Halsey, but no one disputes that to Judge Forman belongs the credit of procuring the first legislative action in connection with it; and it has been well said that "his bringing this resolution before the House of Assembly would alone render his name immortal." Through his untiring zeal, eloquence, and perseverance, a resolution was passed directing a survey to be made "of the most eligible and direct route of a canal to open communication between the tide-waters of the Hudson and Lake Erie." It is not easy to conjecture who would have possessed sufficient moral courage to bring forward a plan that was called "visionary," if it was in truth conceived by either of Judge Forman's contemporaries. In his earnest desire for the public good he forgot the ridicule which met his first suggestions on the subject; and after his novel ideas became public property, save for his energy, the topic might have lain dormant for years so far as legislative action is concerned. His speeches before the Assembly are said to have been masterly in their eloquence. He estimated the cost of the canal at \$10,000,000, and remarked that that sum was a bagatelle to the value of such navigation. His friend and neighbor, Judge James Geddes, was employed to make the surveys of the canal. On its completion, in 1825, there was a celebration along its whole line in all the larger cities, towns, and villages, and Judge Forman was selected by the citizens of Onondaga County, and as President of the village, then, of Syracuse, to address Governor Clinton and suite on their first passage through its waters in November of that year. He had but three hours to prepare the speech, which is here given:

"GENTLEMEN—The roar of cannon rolling from Lake Erie to the ocean, and reverberated from the ocean to the lakes, has announced the completion of the Erie canal, and you are this day witnesses, bearing the waters of the lakes on the unbroken bosom of the canal to be mingled with the ocean, that the splendid hopes of our State are realized. The continued fête which has attended your boats, evinces how dear it was to the hearts of our citizens. It is truly a proud day for the State of New York. No one is present, who has the interest of the State at heart, who does not exult at the completion of a work fraught with such important benefits, and no man with an American

heart, that does not swell with pride that he is a citizen of the country which has accomplished the greatest work of the age, and which has filled Europe with admiration of the American character. On the 4th of July, 1817, it was begun, and it is now accomplished. Not by the labor of abject slaves and vassals, but by the energies of freemen, and in a period unprecedentedly short, by the *voluntary* efforts of its freemen governed by the wisdom of its statesmen. This, however, is but one of the many benefits derived from our free institutions, and which marks a new era in the history of man—the example of a nation whose whole physical power and intelligence are employed to advance the improvement, comfort and happiness of the people.

“To what extent this course of improvement may be carried, it is impossible for any mere man to conjecture; but no reasonable man can doubt that it will continue its progress, until our wide and fertile territory shall be filled with a more dense, intelligent, and happy people than the sun shines upon in the wide circuit of the globe. It has long been the subject of fearful apprehension to the patriots of the Atlantic States that the remote interior situation of our western country (for want of proper stimuli to industry and free intercourse with the rest of the world) would be filled with a semi-barbarous population, uncongenial with their Atlantic neighbors. But the introduction of steamboats on our lakes and running rivers, and canals to connect the waters which nature has disjoined (in both which this State has taken the lead, and its example has now become general), have broken down the old barriers of nature, and promise the wide-spread regions of the west all the blessings of a seaboard district. But while we contemplate the advantages of this work, as a source of revenue to the State, and of wealth and comfort to our citizens, let us never forget the means by which it has been accomplished; and after rendering thanks to the All-Wise Disposer of events, who has by his own means, and for his own purposes, brought about this great work, we would render our thanks to all citizens and statesmen who have, in and out of the Legislature, sustained the measure from its first conception to its present final consummation. To the commissioners who superintended the work, the board of native engineers (a native treasure unknown till called for by the occasion), and especially to his Excellency, the Governor, whose early and decided support of the measure, fearlessly throwing his character and influence into the scale, turned the poising-beam and produced the first canal appropriation, and by his talents and exertions kept public opinion steady to the point. Without his efforts in that crisis the canal project might still have been a splendid vision, gazed upon by the benevolent patriot, but left by cold calumniators to be realized by some future generation. At that time all admitted that there was a high responsibility resting on you, and had it failed you must have largely borne the blame. It has succeeded, and we will not withhold from you your due meed of praise.

“Gentlemen, in behalf of the citizens of Syracuse, and the county of Onondaga, here assembled, I congratulate you on this occasion. Our village is the offspring of the canal, and with the county must partake largely of its blessings. We were most ungrateful if we did not most cordially join in this great State celebration.”

Governor Clinton made a felicitous answer, in which he pointedly referred to the speaker as having introduced the first legislative measures relative to the Erie Canal. As one of the committee from Syracuse, Judge Forman attended the ceremonies of mingling the waters of Lake Erie with those of the ocean off Sandy Hook, which must have been a happy and memorable occasion to him.

During the interval between his election to the Assembly and the completion of the canal, Judge Forman had been influential in promoting the interests of Onondaga County in various ways. He was emphatically the

founder of the city of Syracuse, removing there in 1819 from Onondaga Valley when there was but a small clearing and only two frame houses. He foresaw that it was to become a large inland city, and, in company with Mr. Ebenezer Wilson, purchased what was known as the Walton Tract, consisting of 250 acres, embracing what is now the heart of the city, and caused it to be carefully laid out by his brother, Owen Forman. This property afterward passed into the hands of Wm. H. Sabine and Daniel Kellogg, of Skaneateles, and was sold by them to the Albany Company. In 1807 Judge Forman leased the reservation lands at Oswego Falls and built a grist-mill, then in the wilderness. In 1824 he was active in establishing the first Presbyterian Society in Syracuse, was one of its first treasurers—a beautiful tablet in the Church, erected on the site of the old one, commemorating these events. In 1821 Judge Forman rendered an important service to the citizens of Syracuse by procuring the passage of a law, drawn up by himself, authorizing the lowering of the Onondaga Lake, its overflow at certain seasons of the year having caused much sickness in its vicinity. In 1822 he procured the passage of another law of vital importance to the manufacturers of salt in and near Syracuse. The Salt Springs had been discovered at a very early date, but they had never been thoroughly developed until the Erie Canal was completed. A short canal had been made from the Erie Canal to facilitate the salt-works, but it was insufficient for the purpose of its construction. The law suggested by Judge Forman enabled the manufacturers to erect fixtures for the purpose of making coarse salt by solar evaporation, with a three per cent. per bushel bounty on salt so made for a given number of years; and he induced Governor Clinton to visit the salt-works, and suggested to him that the canal above alluded to should be extended to Onondaga Lake. This was accomplished under Judge Forman's directions, and a Pump House built, thereby substituting water-power instead of hand-labor in elevating the salt water into reservoirs from the Salt Springs, and to be distributed from the reservoirs to the various works. With all his other occupations he found the leisure to write a series of articles in the *Onondaga Register*, signed "X"; to found the Camillus Plaster Company; and in various other ways to be useful to his neighbors.

In 1836 Judge Forman removed to New Brunswick, New Jersey, where he had an interest in a copper mine. He had found that communities, like republics, are ungrateful. Having asked for an office, the income of which he needed, as his own affairs had become complicated through his attention to the interests of other people than his own, the coveted appointment was refused, and it is said that he left the town he founded, and had fostered to

his own detriment, with a saddened heart. Soon after locating in New Jersey, the New York banking system and financial affairs became deranged generally. Our banking laws were very defective, and a reform was all-important; but, while such reform was necessary, no one suggested a remedy until Judge Forman at this crisis proposed a plan of relief. It was approved by Governor Van Buren, who invited him to visit Albany and submit his views to a Committee of the Legislature then in session. At the desire of the Governor he drew up a bill, which subsequently became a law, known as the "Safety Fund Act," the great object of which was to give character to our currency on the one hand, and to protect the bill-holder on the other. At the request of Governor Van Buren, Judge Forman remained at Albany during most of the winter, in attendance on the Legislature and in perfecting the details of an Act that has proved of the greatest importance. This Safety Fund system was exclusively originated, and perfected, by Judge Forman, and, while certain modifications have since been made in our banking laws, it is questioned whether they have been improved. During the War of the Rebellion the General Government adopted Judge Forman's Safety Fund Banking System, and has since used it.

In 1830, Judge Forman, having purchased 300,000 acres of land in North Carolina, went there to superintend its improvement, and settled in the village of Rutherfordton, where he established a newspaper, printing-press, and stage-line, and was considered for a time the most enterprising man in that part of the State. Mrs. Forman having died in New Jersey, the Judge married for his second wife Miss Sarah Garrett, of Warm Springs, Tenn., a lady of high social position and great wealth. In 1831, Judge Forman visited Syracuse, and was everywhere received with marks of the highest esteem. The citizens, through a committee, presented him with a silver pitcher and six silver goblets, the pitcher being inscribed (under clasped hands), "A Tribute of respect presented by the Citizens of Syracuse to the Honorable Joshua Forman, Founder of the Town, 1831." Again, in 1846, when seventy years of age, and enfeebled by illness, Judge Forman came North to visit the scenes of his early triumphs and disappointments. Having heard wonderful stories of the growth of Syracuse he came to behold it. On this occasion a public dinner was given him at the Syracuse House, when the most distinguished gentlemen of the county and the neighborhood were present. For the greater part, those present were his personal friends. Years had passed since he had visited the city of his invention, and it was an occasion of peculiar pleasure to him to find that his early predictions regarding it had been verified. He met only with the warmest greetings from these friends of his youth, and bade them all an affectionate farewell.

Two years later he breathed his last in Rutherfordton, N. C. His remains have been removed to Oakwood Cemetery, near Syracuse, and repose beside those of his daughter, Mrs. E. W. Leavenworth, recently deceased. A few words may be written in conclusion as to the personal appearance and character of this distinguished man.

Judge Forman was tall, finely formed; had a pleasing face, and a most winning smile. His manners were elegant, his demeanor dignified, and his conversational powers of the rarest kind. Mr. Thurlow Weed says of him, "To hear Judge Forman express an opinion was to be convinced." "His voice was musical," says another who remembers him well, "and whenever he talked he had an audience."

With an intellect of unusual brilliancy, a remarkably fine education, and unusual opportunities, Judge Forman was a good neighbor, an able jurist, and an eminent legislator; in short, a man in whom we find nothing we cannot at once respect and admire. His entire life seemed spent in the most enthusiastic efforts for the general benefit of his fellow-creatures. He forgot his own interests in those of his friends, and in his zeal for the public welfare. His character is without a stain, and his memory is entitled to the gratitude, the admiration, and the undying esteem of his countrymen.

ELLEN E. DICKINSON

SYRACUSE—Syracuse was formed out of the township of Salina, the place being known as "Cossit's Corners," and later as "Corinth." In 1820 the place contained about two hundred and fifty inhabitants. It was incorporated as a village April 13, 1825, and as the City of Syracuse in 1845, including the village of Salina. Its growth has proved rapid. The city is chiefly indebted to the Erie Canal and the salt springs. These springs are more potent than the Fountain of Arethusa in classic Syracuse. Some of the wells have a depth of four hundred feet. Experiments made by order of the Secretary of War prove that the salt made here is quite equal to the best foreign salt. The works here are very numerous, being also the most extensive and valuable in the United States. The land containing the springs is the property of the State, which receives a royalty on the salt produced. This amounts to many millions of bushels annually, the water being inexhaustible. Both solar and artificial heat is used in producing the salt. Syracuse, however, has other manufactures, such as those of machinery and steam engines.

THE GREAT NORTHWEST

THE NATURE OF THE TITLES BY WHICH IT HAS BEEN HELD, AND WHEN,
HOW, AND BY WHOM WERE THOSE TITLES ACQUIRED

Few sections of our country possess greater historic interest than that generally known, during the latter half of the eighteenth and the earlier years of the nineteenth centuries, as the GREAT NORTHWEST. The boundaries of the territory, thus named, were the Alleghany Mountains on the east, the Mississippi River on the west, the chain of northern lakes on the north, and the Great Kanawha River, from the Alleghany Mountains to its mouth, and the Ohio River from thence to its mouth, on the south.

Before this romantic and now historic section of our country was explored by the French, in the seventeenth century, its sole occupants were uncivilized, wandering, hostile tribes of red men exclusively devoted to the chase and to war. Chief among these were the Shawanese, Miamis, the Illinois, and (before their subjugation by the Five Nations, otherwise called Iroquois) the Ottawas, Wyandots (called Hurons by the French), and the Eries, once very numerous and formidable in war, who principally occupied lands contiguous to the southern shore of the lower end of Lake Erie. Here was conducted, during the seventeenth century (about 1654, perhaps), the exterminating war between the Eries and the Five Nations, in which the former were utterly defeated, overthrown—in fact, virtually wiped out of existence. The conquering Iroquois were a confederacy of nations composed of the Senecas, Mohawks, Oneidas, Onondagas, and Cayugas, being five nations at this time, to which was added, in the year 1712, the Tuscarora nation, making the Iroquois confederacy “the Six Nations,” by which title it was subsequently known.

From the beginning of the historic period (and probably from a period long anterior to that) down to the middle of the eighteenth century, the savage occupants of the Great Northwest were almost constantly engaged in fierce contests among themselves, which frequently well-nigh resulted (immediately or ultimately) almost in the total destruction of tribes and nations. Perfidy, revenge, cruelty were their principal characteristics. Treachery, barbarity, vindictiveness marked the conduct of individual man toward man, of tribe toward tribe, and of nation toward nation.

But it was not intended to be always thus in this fair land, and this goodly heritage, destined for civilized man, was soon to become his pos-

session and enjoyment. This "waste howling wilderness" in time blossomed as the rose. Civilized, Christianized men of different countries and nationalities, speaking different languages, ultimately, one after another, obtained possession of this portion of the American continent, exercising controlling authority over it, permanently establishing institutions of civilization and Christianity, to be transmitted, in all their vigor and glory, to their posterity.

The English were the first of the white race, within the historic period, to assert ownership of the Great Northwest. England's title was founded upon priority of discovery, priority of occupancy, and priority as well as continuity of possession. The weak points in England's title (and the strong ones too, perhaps) to the Great Northwest may become apparent in the light of the following historical facts :

In March, 1496, John and Sebastian Cabot (father and son), both British subjects living at Bristol, England, obtained authority from Henry VII. to go forth into the northern and western Atlantic, to make discoveries and to occupy and assert title, on behalf of the English king, to whatever lands were found. They sailed forth on their mission in May, 1497, and on June 24, 1497, discovered Newfoundland, and erected the banners of England upon its shores. Some suppose that they then sailed along the coast of North America as far as Florida.

Elizabeth, queen of England, in 1584 granted a patent to Walter Raleigh (with the title of Lord Proprietor) to an immense region on the Atlantic coast, with authority to settle an English colony. The coast was reached within the present limits of Virginia, and named in honor of the Virgin Queen. Raleigh, however, failed in the attempt to make the contemplated colonial settlement upon the land covered by his patent from his patron queen, and the grant reverted to others, Raleigh being executed, in 1618, in the reign of James I.

Again, in May, 1607, a company of one hundred and five English colonists, under the patronage of the London Company, which carried on its operations under a charter from King James I., settled on the James River and built Jamestown, the first town built in the ancient commonwealth of Virginia. The charter of the London Company conveyed to them all the country two hundred miles north and a like distance south of Old Point Comfort, extending west to the Pacific Ocean, making a tract of land four hundred miles wide and about three thousand miles long, embracing much, if not all, of the Great Northwest. This charter bore date April 10, 1606, and was supplemented by two others, bearing dates respectively May 23, 1609, and March 12, 1611, which conferred other rights and enlarged their

privileges and powers. In 1607, the Plymouth Company commenced the colony in Maine, with a charter similar to that of the London Company.

In addition, it may be stated that all the colonial governors of Virginia, beginning with Lord Delaware in 1609, and ending with Lord Dunmore in 1776, were appointed in England and acted under and by English authority, showing that England's right to exercise sovereign control here, from the first settlement of the colony until the beginning of the Revolutionary War, was uninterruptedly maintained and recognized by all interested, except, for a brief period, by France.

Moreover, many hundreds of English colonists were settled in Virginia from year to year, who established numerous other settlements which became permanently prosperous. Thus England had acquired title by discovery of the Cabots, by the occupancy of English colonists in 1607, and subsequently by possession of the country by British subjects, and by the continuous exercise of authority by the English Crown from 1609 to the beginning of the Revolution.

This continuous exercise of authority, let it be borne in mind, was (before the peace of 1763) confined to regions east of the Alleghany Mountains, and, of course, did not embrace the Great Northwest, with boundaries as before given. But England claimed the right to govern the portion of country herein called the Great Northwest, for the reason that it was included in and formed a part of the country conveyed by the charter of King James the First, bearing date April 10, 1606, to the celebrated London Land Company, although the regions here defined as the Great Northwest were at that time unknown to the English government and the English people, and so remained many years. The first attempt of the English looking to permanent occupancy was in 1749, when they erected a trading house at or near the mouth of Loramie's Creek on the Great Miami. This was the "Pickawillany" of history, being attacked by French and Indians in 1752 and destroyed.

The following facts, which are in the main well authenticated, may throw some light on the question of title by France to the Great Northwest. Late and approved authorities make it manifest that Jean Nicollet, an adventurous French missionary and explorer, as early as 1634-35, penetrated that portion of the Great Northwest now known as Wisconsin. He went from Canada to Green Bay during the latter half of the year 1634, and from thence proceeded westward, going a long distance into those then unknown western regions, probably approaching the western limits of what is now the State of Wisconsin. This view is substantially maintained by several accredited writers and historians (Wisconsin Historical Collections, volume

VIII). Mr. C. W. Butterfield, author of "Crawford's Sandusky Campaign," a credible and well-known historian, is authority for the statement that "Nicollet, a Frenchman, left Quebec in the summer of 1634, and visited the Winnebagoes, in Wisconsin, and returned in the summer of 1635, and that he was the first white man to see the Northwest." Parkman expresses the belief that Nicollet passed up the Fox River, crossed the portage to the Wisconsin River, and down that stream a considerable distance, though probably not to its mouth. He, however, thinks it occurred in or before the year 1639.

In 1641, a number of French priests explored the Northwest, and took measures to establish missions there. Among others were Raymbault, Pigart, Jogues, and Bressani, who were soon followed by some French traders and explorers, including Brabceuf, Daniel, Lallemant, and Rene Mesnard, who passed around the southern shore of Lake Superior. Nicolas Perrot, Claude Allouez, Jaques Marquette, Claude Dablon, and St. Luson came later, and in 1671 proceeded, with stately ceremonies, to take possession of the country in behalf of France, in the name of the French monarch, Louis the Fourteenth.

La Salle, the great explorer, as early as 1669-71, discovered and navigated the Ohio and Illinois rivers, and it is of authentic history that this bold adventurer and enterprising explorer built a vessel of about forty-five tons burden, near the lower end of Lake Erie, in 1679, called the "Griffin," with which he navigated lakes Erie, St. Clair, Huron, Michigan, and to the entrance of Green Bay, having thus voyaged along nearly three-fourths of the entire northern boundary of the Great Northwest. This he accomplished more than two hundred years ago. It is also a well-authenticated fact that Marquette and Joliet, distinguished Frenchmen, the former a priest, and the latter a trader and explorer, in 1673 passed from Green Bay, by way of the Wisconsin River, into the Mississippi River, descending to the region of Arkansas, fearing to go farther on account of the Indians and Spaniards.

On the sixth of February, 1682, nearly two hundred years ago, La Salle entered upon the turbid waters of the Mississippi River, at the mouth of the Illinois River, and floating southward passed the outlets of the Missouri and Ohio rivers, and sailing down the mighty current of the great river of the West to its entrance into the Gulf of Mexico, which he reached April 9, 1682, took possession of the country as its discoverer in the name of the King of France, called it *Louisiana*, and virtually defined its boundaries "to include all the lands on all the streams that discharged themselves into the Ohio and Mississippi rivers."

France continued from time to time to reaffirm its title and by various

acts to reassert and perpetuate its claim to the Great Northwest, such as encouraging the building of churches, and sending priests to minister in them; establishing trading posts; countenancing emigration hither; giving encouragement to traffic with the Indian tribes; aiding in making improvements and building villages; erecting forts, and sending adequate military detachments from time to time, for the defence of those French subjects who had placed themselves under the protection of their government and still professed allegiance to it.

One of the most conspicuous official acts of the government of France, in reaffirmation of title *to* and reassertion of rights hitherto acquired, *in* the Great Northwest, was performed in 1749. Captain Celeron, a French officer, was placed by the French government at the head of a force of three hundred men, and commanded to go to the Ohio, take possession of the country in the name of his king, and deposit leaden plates in the ground at or near the mouths of streams emptying into the Alleghany and Ohio rivers. In obedience to this command Captain Celeron promptly deposited plates with suitable inscriptions at the following points: *First*, at the mouth of Conewango Creek, on the south bank of the Alleghany River near the present town of Warren. *Second*, at a point on the Alleghany River, a number of miles below the mouth of French Creek, near a large rock on which were rudely engraved numerous figures. *Third*, at the mouth of Wheeling Creek in the present city of Wheeling. *Fourth*, at the mouth of the Muskingum River where Fort Harmer was built in 1786. *Fifth*, at the mouth of the Great Kanawha River; and the *Sixth* and last plate being buried at the mouth of the Great Miami River.

The two plates buried respectively at the junction of the Muskingum and Kanawha rivers with the Ohio, and deposited with so much parade and ceremony by order of Louis XV., nearly a century before, have been found—the Kanawha plate in March, 1846. It is described in Craig's "Olden Time" (vol. I., pp. 238-40). A fac-simile is given in the same volume (pp. 336-7). The inscription in full, in French, is accompanied with an English translation. The plate is a fraction over seven inches wide and nearly eleven inches and a half long. It is said to have been about a quarter of an inch thick. The following is the translation given of the inscription on the Kanawha plate:

"In the year 1749, in the reign of Louis XV., King of France, we, Celeron, Commandant of a detachment sent by the Marquis de la Galissoniere, Commandant-General of New France, to re-establish tranquillity in some Indian towns in these departments, have buried this plate at the mouth of the river Chinodahichetha [Kanawha], this 18th day of August, near the river

Ohio, otherwise called Beautiful River, as a memorial of the resumption of possession we have made of the said river Ohio, and all those that fall into it, and of all the lands on both sides up to the sources of said rivers, the same as the preceding Kings of France have enjoyed or were entitled to enjoy, and as they were established by arms and by treaties, especially by those of Ryswick, Utrecht, and Aix la Chapelle." (Craig's "Olden Time," p. 240.)

In a preceding paragraph reference was made to the fact that the French government displayed a good degree of activity and vigilance about the middle of the last century by the erection of forts or military posts at various points in the Great Northwest, having in direct view the perpetuation of their power there. Among these forts were those of *Presque Isle*, on Lake Erie; *Le Bœuf*, on French Creek; *Venango*, at the mouth of the French Creek, on the Alleghany River; *Du Quesne*, at the junction of the Alleghany and Monongahela rivers; *Massac*, on the lower Ohio. There were also forts in possession of the French, at this period, at Detroit, Vincennes, and at various other points.

In addition to this, the French emissaries, priests, and soldiers made most extraordinary and measurably successful efforts to conciliate the Indian tribes of the Great Northwest, thereby largely securing a monopoly of trade, rendering them also the more accessible to the French Jesuits in their labors to proselyte them to the faith of the Roman Catholic Church, and securing their aid as allies in their subsequent struggles to maintain their power against British armies and American colonists.

All these and many other manifestations of the French government and French people were regarded by the British Crown and English people, also by the American colonists and the Colonial governments, in the light of a constant menace. The rights of the English government and of the American colonists (while in subordination to that government) *in or to* the Great Northwest, in contrast with those of the French and Indians, will be very briefly considered, inasmuch as the antagonizing parties were, at this time (1750-54), vigorously urging the validity of their respective titles.

England, previous to the ratification of the treaty of Paris, concluded with the United States in 1784, claimed to have the same right to govern the Great Northwest that she had to govern the colonies situated along the Atlantic coast, and whose inhabitants resided chiefly east of the Alleghany Mountains, which was done through the agency of the Colonial governors appointed by the Crown, and in pursuance of laws enacted by the British Parliament and Colonial legislatures; and, about the middle of the last century, began to enter emphatic protests against the encroachments of

France, also to deny the right of the latter to exercise authority in the "Ohio country." The demonstrative and even domineering performances of the subalterns of France in the country bordering on the Ohio and Alleghany rivers were peculiarly offensive. Especially did England contest the right of France, whose title, the former maintained, was held by an uncertain and insufficient tenure, not warranting those affirmative and even aggressive acts which have been briefly detailed in preceding paragraphs.

Those well versed in our early-time Western history well know that so persistently offensive had France become, by her encroachments and unceasing aggressions in the "Ohio country," that Governor Dinwiddie, of Virginia, in November, 1753, commissioned George Washington (then less than twenty-two years of age) an "express messenger to proceed, with all possible despatch, to the place on the Ohio River where the French had lately erected a fort or forts, or where the French Commandant resided, in order to deliver his letter and message to him." This was done with the hope of checking or, if possible, terminating the aggressions of the French, but no favorable results followed. The French were unmoved, and it was manifest that the question in issue between the English and French would have to be settled by the arbitrament of the sword.

A disastrous war was the result, in which French and Indians were the combatants on one side, and the English and Americans on the other—the Indians being the allies of the French, and the Americans of the English.

Several small military expeditions in the interest of the English claim, notably those of Captain Trent and Major George Washington, were sent against the French on the Ohio during the year 1754, which, however, accomplished nothing. But toward the close of the year a somewhat formidable army was organized by his Britannic Majesty, and placed under the command of General Braddock, who, with his army, landed at Alexandria, Virginia, in February, 1755, and soon started on the march to meet the French and their allies, the Indians, in the "Ohio country." Governor Dinwiddie, of Virginia, aided by the governors of other provinces, co-operated with his Britannic Majesty's army to the extent of raising six companies of Provincial troops, which were placed under the immediate command of Colonel Joshua Fry and Lieutenant-Colonel George Washington. These all joined the main army at the mouth of Wills Creek (Fort Cumberland) and, cutting a road through the woods and over the mountains, finally reached the mouth of Turtle Creek on the Monongahela River July 9, 1755, where the combined armies (British and Provincials) encountered the French and Indians, and were not only defeated but completely demoralized and overthrown, a

large number, especially of the officers, having been either killed or mortally wounded, General Braddock himself being among the latter.

Hostilities continued on the Western borders, the title of his Britannic Majesty to the "Ohio country" being still confidently and boldly asserted and vigorously maintained. To establish and enforce the claims of the English, a large army of British and Provincial troops was organized in 1758, and placed under the command of General Forbes (the Colonial forces being under the direct command of Colonel George Washington) and marched across the mountains, through the wilderness, over roads constructed, for the most part, for the occasion, to Fort Du Quesne, at the forks of the Ohio, which, on hearing of the near approach of the armies of Forbes and Washington, the French quietly and without resistance abandoned. The English, becoming proprietors, changed the name to Fort Pitt, in honor of the Prime Minister. The French never recovered possession. This achievement was succeeded the next year (1759) by three military expeditions to Canada and along the northern border, commanded respectively by General Wolf, General Amherst, and General Prideaux. The former moved against Quebec, which fell into the hands of the English army; Amherst obtained possession of Ticondéroga and Crown Point; and Niagara surrendered and passed into the possession of the English. The attempt of the French forces to recapture Fort Pitt this year also failed, and the power of the French was completely broken in America by the English successes of 1759. These decisive victories were so overwhelming as to put an end to all direct contest between the British and French in the West. Canada was lost to France, British supremacy was established in North America, and France never again asserted or attempted to maintain, by force of arms, her claim to the Great Northwest. The French forts in the "Ohio country" passed under English control; and we look to the treaty of Paris, of 1763, for the conditions on which the questions hitherto in issue in the "Valley of the Ohio," between France and England, were settled. In this change of ownership and exercise of authority there seemed a fair promise of increased protection, peace, and tranquillity to the few scattered, isolated, courageous, but greatly exposed frontiersmen who had already, in the indulgence of most perilous daring, erected and occupied their rude, humble cabins on the border land, the disputed territory between the Alleghany Mountains and the Ohio River, as well as to those of their no less courageous fellows who, thereafter, in the fearlessness of their undaunted heroism and daring, also chose to brave the privations and dangers of the wilderness and the perils of life on the outskirts of civilization, within ready approach of hostile tribes of treacherous, malignant, vindictive savages.

All this and more was ventured, accomplished, and endured in the "*border land*" at the period named; much more, and on a greatly augmented scale, was all this true during the early years of British rule there, when settlements were rapidly made on our western borders by a stalwart race of vigorous, heroic pioneers, fairly represented by the Zanes, the Crawfords, the McCulloughs, the Cresaps, the Shepherds, the Kentons, the Wilsons, the Hughes, the Clarks, the Bradys, the Johnsons, the Poes, the Williams, the Lochrys, the Wetzels.

In 1763 the English government was recognized as the ruling power in the "Ohio Valley," exercising authority then, or soon after, as far west as the Mississippi River. England had possession of Fort Pitt and other military posts. One of the earliest acts of a civil nature bearing *upon* or relating *to* the Great Northwest, by way of asserting England's control here, was the passage of an act in 1769, by the House of Burgesses of the Colony of Virginia (the colony being then loyal to the British Crown, and being governed by an English governor), establishing the county of Botetourt, with the Mississippi River as its western boundary and the Blue Ridge as its eastern.

Another act, by way of asserting title, was the exercise of authority over the Great Northwest, by the English Crown, by the passage of a law by the British Parliament, in 1774, making the Ohio River the *southwestern* boundary of Canada, and the Mississippi River its *western* boundary, thereby making these extensive regions a part of the Province of Quebec, for a brief period only, that is, if Parliament enactments were of paramount authority to those of a Colonial Legislature; but English authority here was in a state of abeyance during the Revolutionary War. Civil government, in fact, between the Ohio and Mississippi rivers and the northern lakes, was probably more mythical than real, more theory than reality, previous to the year 1778, when General George Rogers Clarke conquered the country. He acted under the authority and patronage of the Governor of Virginia, Patrick Henry, and of his confidential counsellors Thomas Jefferson, George Wythe, and George Mason. His conquests and acquisitions therefore inured to the benefit of Virginia. By act of the Legislature, the country northwest of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi was organized into Illinois County, Virginia, in October, 1778, and Colonel John Todd was appointed by the Governor of Virginia Civil Commandant and Lieutenant of the county, who served until 1782. He was killed in the battle of Blue Licks, Kentucky, and Timothy de Montbrun succeeded him. The General Assembly of Virginia, in 1783, passed a law authorizing the conveyance to the United States of all "right and title of Virginia to the territory northwest-

ward of the river Ohio," which was accepted by Congress in 1784, and civil government was fully established there, in 1788, by the Government of the United States, which since then has had exclusive authority over it.

The English government was the ruling power in the Great Northwest during the period between the treaty of Paris of 1763 and the beginning of the Revolution, but the few inhabitants here denied the right of his Britannic Majesty to exercise authority over them during the seven years of our Revolutionary War. After the close of that war, the provisions of the treaty of 1784 put an end to the exercise of authority by the English government in the Great Northwest, *and that forever!* By the terms of said treaty the United States came upon the theatre and theoretically and practically obtained recognition as one of the independent nations, and in the exercise of its sovereignty took possession of the Great Northwest.

The Indian occupants had asserted contesting titles to these extensive regions, but these contesting titles were all finally extinguished by the provisions of numerous treaties entered into with them, including the treaty of Fort Stanwix, in 1784; of Fort McIntosh, concluded in 1785; of Fort Finney, entered into in 1786; of Fort Harmar, in 1789; of Vincennes, in 1792; of Greenville, in 1795; of Fort Wayne, in 1803; of Fort Industry, in 1805; and many others. But a potential factor in the final settlement of all issues between the Indian races, occupying this disputed territory, and the Government of the United States was found in the various military expeditions organized to quiet titles in the Great Northwest, ending with that of the illustrious General Anthony Wayne to the Maumee in August, 1794, where, in the well-fought battle of "Fallen Timbers" (which was the crowning victory of our long war with the Western savage tribes), was secured to the Great Northwest the peace and tranquillity guaranteed by the memorable treaty of Greenville, concluded in 1795.

Nearly forty years intervened between General Braddock's defeat on the banks of the Monongahela River, in July, 1755, and the great victory achieved by General Anthony Wayne, on the Maumee, in August, 1794. In the disastrous battle with the British general, on the Monongahela, the Indians were undoubtedly victorious, and in the contest with the American general, on the Maumee, they were most signally defeated. The discomfited, defeated army of General Braddock that, during the year 1755, in the interest of England, marched across the trackless mountain ranges which formed the dividing line between the civilized and savage races was the first that encountered the hostile tribes of red men in fierce and bloody contest for supremacy within the region designated as the Great Northwest; and the successful and victorious army of General Wayne, in 1794,

was the last one of the eighteenth century that thus encountered the hostile tribes of the West. The magnitude of the interests involved in the issue pending here, during nearly all the years of the latter half of the last century, could not well be exaggerated. It was a contest for recognized, undivided, undisturbed occupancy by the savage tribes of the aforementioned territory, who claimed the right to exercise ownership over it, and who determined that it should remain in its primitive natural state, to serve the purposes of hunting-grounds for them, never to be encroached upon by white men, or by any civilized races of mankind who assumed to claim title to it either by reason of discovery, occupancy, possession, or by purchase. On the other hand, soon after the successful expedition of Colonel Bouquet to the Muskingum in 1764, white settlers from east of the Alleghanies established themselves near the foot of the western slopes of said mountains and slowly extended their settlements westward, toward the Ohio River. Those settlements were regarded by the Indians as encroachments to be resisted unto death. The red men opposed, with the energy of desperation, the efforts of the whites to push their settlements westward. They struggled to maintain barbarism against civilization—Paganism against Christianity,—but were gradually overpowered by the daring frontiersmen, who, notwithstanding the resistance of the savages, steadily advanced westward, continually braving their stealthy, vindictive foes, tendering them a perpetual challenge, and ever maintaining a menacing, defying attitude—in short, a “conquer or die” attitude. And *they conquered*.

Pontiac, Cornstalk, Logan, Black Hawk, Little Turtle, Tecumseh, Blue Jacket are all gone, and uninterrupted peace is enjoyed by the more than thirteen millions of human beings that inhabit the Great Northwest. The title of this great nation to the territory of the five States and four fractional States that constitute the Northwest, “there is none to dispute.” We have all the title that England may have acquired by discovery. We have also all the title that France subsequently claimed to have acquired, by reason of discovery and occupancy, the French government having transferred everything to England by the treaty of Paris of 1763, which we acquired upon the failure of England to subdue the colonists, and which the mother country secured to the United States by the guarantees contained in the Treaty of Peace of 1784. Finally, as already stated, we acquired all the title the Indian tribes possessed, first by conquest and subsequently by purchase and by treaty negotiations.

A hundred years ago the Great Northwest was a wilderness, occupied by perhaps a hundred thousand uncivilized red men and a few thousand Frenchmen living in Vincennes, Detroit, Kaskaskia, Cahokia, and in a few

other villages and sparse settlements here and there; also a very few thousand frontiersmen enjoying a semi-civilized mode of life, between the Alleghany Mountains and the Ohio River, and between Lake Erie and the Kanawha River. More than thirteen millions of civilized, free, independent people now occupy the same territory. This contrast between a hundred years ago and the present day clearly shows the superiority of civilization to barbarism—of Christianity to Paganism.

In conclusion, from the brief notes presented it is manifest that at least four different peoples or governments have at different periods, within historic times, claimed ownership of the Great Northwest and exercised civil authority over the inhabitants, sometimes ruling them by military power. These were, first, the various Indian tribes that occupied the country; second, the English and French governments—the latter, after claiming ownership and exercising authority, civil and military, over these extensive regions from 1671 to 1763, a period of ninety-two years, finally surrendering all claim of title to it at the last-named date; the former (the British government), after claiming title for nearly two centuries, ultimately, by acceding to the provisions of the treaty of Paris, ratified in 1784, surrendering perpetually all right to ownership and authority. Lastly, by the Government of the United States, which, in pursuance of the ordinance of 1787, enacted by Congress under the Articles of Confederation, established civil government here during the next year, under which benign rule the people of the Great Northwest have, for more than three generations, enjoyed a degree of prosperity and happiness seldom, if ever, paralleled.

The United States, in a few brief months after establishing a territorial government "Northwest of the River Ohio," adopted a constitution, and became thereby a constitutional government, a NATION, under whose just and equitable legislation and wise statesmanship, for the last ninety-two years (just the number of years of French rule here), the Great Northwest has become emphatically great—great, not only in territorial extent and prolific soil, but also great in the immensity, variety, and value of her productions—in the excellence of her common schools—in the amplitude of her educational facilities for all of school age—in the number and superiority of her higher educational institutions, colleges, and universities—in the number, variety, and character of her benevolent institutions—in the number of liberally sustained Christian churches, whose pulpits are generally occupied by a competent learned ministry—and in the intelligence, the virtue, the intellectual and moral culture, the Christian civilization that characterize her more than thirteen millions of inhabitants.

ISAAC SMUCKER

THE PICTURESQUE IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The principal dates, names, and general results connected with the American Revolution we have learned during our school-days, but how seldom do we contemplate the picturesque in its history! There are other truths embalmed by history than those which are treasured in the note-books of political economists or statistical collectors, results of higher value than any theory of wages, or of population. These are the lessons of a moral and religious nature, of single-hearted patriotism, of generous self-denial, and transparent public virtue, through which the virtues of the fire-side and *home* are clearly seen. When they come before the eye embodied in incidents that are picturesque, they lose none of their value, but deserve and command as much genuine interest and admiration as were ever bestowed on the happiest combination of Nature's or of Art's results. If some matter-of-fact persons prefer to wander through dusky avenues where the grim skeletons of departed ages are preserved, may there not be others who prefer a ramble through that picture gallery whose walls are clothed in colors undimmed by time, and forms and figures that realize the spirit of the past?

The sense of the beautiful is an instinct of our nature which tells us through mere impressions what is homely or picturesque, just as the instincts of the body teach us what is sweet or bitter, fragrant or offensive; and it has equal scope, be the object of contemplation the record of man's high doings or the workings of Nature's changing scene. In each the mind may discover much, or may see nothing. In Nature the commonest sights and the commonest sounds are rich for the poet and poor for the man of prose. To the voice of the wind, to the common notes of the winter night, there are many souls in which no echo is awakened, no thought aroused, except, perhaps, the thought that it is very cold out of doors, or very comfortable within. Yet to others how mournfully and how powerfully do all these voices speak! A great poet has said that there is nothing so like the voice of the Spirit as the wind, and I myself have heard from a young and mourning mother's lips, who dreamed not of technical poetry when she spoke, a thought which was the whispered echo of that spirit's voice, and showed how strongly the poetic instinct may operate unconsciously. For what technical poet is there who could suggest a more poetical idea than hers, when she heard the sighing of the wind on the first

night of a mother's desolation, and said that she thought it brought a message from the fresh grave of her buried child to beg its mother to come and sit and sing by its lonely pillow? Yet this was the voice of the same wind to which the prosaic man listened without emotion.

There is no exclusive theory of poetic sentiment. We are told that it is

"The *meanest* floweret of the vale,
The *simplest* note that swells the gale,
The *common* air, the sun, the skies,"

that can awaken bright associations in the mind of man. Indeed the golden threads of history's romance are interwoven in the russet garment of every day's doings, so that you have only to hold it in its true light to see it shining and glittering as gayly and brilliantly as if the hand of an enchanter had worked it for holiday attire, and woven it all of golden tissue.

Is there a school-boy, or one who remembers his school-boy days, who, when reminded of it, will not acknowledge the enduring feeling which some one incident in the history of our Revolution must have awakened in his generous bosom, and that, too, less because the moral was striking than because the incidents were picturesque. The classical student is familiar with the mournful tragedy which, in the reign of the first emperor of Rome, cost the empire the flower of its army, and wrung from the lips of one, whose career of prosperity knew no interruption but this, a bitter lamentation, "Quintilius Varus, restore me my legions." It was the cry of that emperor when he thought of his soldiers massacred amidst the forests of Germany, led thither by the rashness of an experienced general. Under a succeeding reign, a victorious Roman army, led by Germanicus, penetrated these very forests, and came, as it were by chance, to the scene of former discomfiture. Beautiful and impressive as is the narrative which the Roman annalist gives of the scene which then ensued, more picturesque is the parallel which our own early history affords, and it is the romance in this parallel which has always impressed me, for in it there seems all the poetical accessories that sometimes make history so picturesque.

On the evening of July 8, 1755, in the deep recesses of what was then a Pennsylvania wilderness, a young Virginian soldier, just twenty-three years of age, emerged from the forest and found himself, after a toilsome and solitary journey, in the presence of a large and well-appointed British army. The sun was just setting, and cast its bright beams upon the still waters of the river that flowed gently by, and on the gay banners and burnished accoutrements of this proud array. Officers and men were alike inspired with cheering hopes and confident anticipations. Every man was neatly

dressed in full uniform, the soldiers were formed in columns and marched in exact order, the sun gleamed upon their burnished arms, and the deep forest overshadowed them with solemn grandeur. Thus it was that the young Virginian, George Washington, then a colonel in the militia, having been detained by sickness on the road, rejoined the army of General Braddock, the Quintilius Varus of his time. The noon of the next day's sun looked down upon a scene of savage victory and ruthless massacre. But the sequel of that gay parade I need not repeat.

How picturesque must have been the doings of the "Old Congress," and it is indeed a great misfortune that its secret doings and deliberations are almost entirely lost to our history. The witnesses of that conclave have one by one gone down to the grave. How little concord prevailed at some periods may be inferred from the following anecdote, for which I am indebted to the retentive memory of one of my aged friends, who has not forgotten his revolutionary lineage.

On the 8th day of May, 1776, while Congress was in session in Philadelphia, the sound of heavy artillery was heard down the Delaware. It was soon known that it proceeded from the gunboats that had been sent to protect the river from the British cruisers. Hitherto no sound of actual war had reached this portion of the province, where the inhabitants were more pacific in their tone than was suited to the ardor and exasperation of New England. As the sound of the first cannon burst upon the ear of Congress, old Samuel Adams sprang upon his feet and cried out with much exultation, to the infinite dismay of some timid members who sat near him, "*Thank God! the game's begun, no one can stop it now.*" "I wish that man was in *heaven*," was the ejaculation of one of his neighbors. "No, not in heaven," said another with a countenance of unmitigated disgust—"not in heaven, for I hope to get there some day myself."

In concord or discord, the work of the Old Congress was almost miraculous, and it is a pity that beyond its general results we know but little. What a rich addition to our history would it be if the illuminated record of these councils were by some kind act of Providence yet rescued from oblivion! What wish is there nearer to the heart of the American historian than that this record may yet be saved, that the scrutiny of some one who has forgotten perhaps that he had ever a drop of the "blood of the Revolution" in his veins, may yet find some portion of that record in a forgotten trunk in some neglected garret? That there was in such a body discordant opinions, hotly and angrily maintained, that there were some corrupt motives and selfish purposes is no doubt true, but that the vast and controlling ma-

jority was purely patriotic and imbued with the true spirit of heroic virtue the result has shown, and after all the one answer to all criticism, the best test of all work, is *result*.

How picturesque, how almost miraculous, was the work of the "Old Congress," for although it met as a mere deliberative convention, with hardly a shadow of authority under the law or provincial constitution, it became almost imperceptibly the government itself. It raised armies, appointed generals, levied taxes, made treaties, without even the semblance of regular authority. Such the success, such the result of justified revolution.

It would be in vain to attempt in this article to point out the many picturesque incidents of that great struggle which began with the session of the first Congress, in September, 1774, and terminated at the signing of the Provisional Treaty, on the 30th of November, 1782. Equally vain to endeavor to trace the romance of the Revolution even through its battles. There was not one, beginning at Lexington and ending at Yorktown, that had not some coloring of romance about it. Trenton, Princeton, and Germantown emphatically so; and the whole Southern campaign, from the rout at Camden through the bright series of victories at Guilford, till the British troops were hemmed in at Yorktown, was a tissue of exploits picturesque as they were gallant. But to judge more accurately of the romance and purity of our Revolution, contrast it for a moment with that other of history's records which was so soon after written—the revolution in France. I have often endeavored to find, either in the aggregate or in the details, any trait on which the poetical instinct can dwell in the annals of Revolutionary France. They were tragic enough, but it was that unvarying, unmitigated tragedy which nauseates the mind with horrors. There was no more poetry in it than there is in the gallows. There was not a leaf, or a flower, or a fragrant herb ever cast into the boiling caldron, or bubbled to its surface; but it was like witchcraft's dread mixture which the poet tells of, the fermentation of coarse ingredients. There was no object of sympathy. The Republic itself was no creation of beauty, even as it sprang from its birthplace. There was the helmet and the sword and the Gorgon shield, with all its hissing snakes, but there was not the majestic beauty or the stately step of the Goddess. When the Republic fell, after it had so often changed its garb from one costume of frippery to another, and so often washed its bloody hands, I know nothing to compare it to in all its mutilated and unpitied deformity than that most disgusting of all its horrible pictures, when Robespierre lay extended on a table in the Committee of Public Safety, with his hands tied behind him like a common felon's, his jaw broken

by his own cowardly pistol-shot, dressed in a sky blue silk coat, his powdered hair and lace ruffles dabbled in his own blood. It was the very incarnation of French republicanism in its last unpitied agonies.

In its less appalling traits, Revolutionary France was a great theatre, where a play was played with all the ranting and strutting and tinsel of the acting drama; and their great men, from Mirabeau, the greatest of them all, downward on the roll to the poorest strolling patriot of the smallest section, each was but the mock hero of his own stage, where virtue is faction and blood and carnage was the only reality. If, with its full record spread out before the eye, one was called upon to point his finger to any incident that deserved the name of purely picturesque, it could not be done further than by indicating the heroic conduct of the two advocates who volunteered to defend the king at the bar of the Convention, and the last hours of the poor queen, that star which shone so brightly in its occident, and shot forth a new beam as it touched the rugged borders of its last horizon, widowed and childless, a gray-haired young woman, who died divested of all a woman's beauty, save that which mantled on her cheeks in childhood and crimsoned them at her last moment on the scaffold—the inextinguishable beauty of a modest woman's blush. All else was fantastic horror and nothing more. What a contrast does it present to the romantic dignity and virtuous grace of our Revolution! Compare the old Continental Congress, an assembly which in gravity and heroism would have done honor to ancient Rome, with the notables, or the Assembly, or the Convention! Take Mirabeau, or Roland, or Brissot, or Dumouriez, and contrast each and all of them with the true chivalry of our annals, our soldiers and statesmen, and the palm is ours. Our men of chivalry in the field I need not name. In the councils of the American Revolution true chivalry was not wanting. The history of the Old Congress, from its first feeble convocation to its eclipse under the federal Constitution, is of itself a rich record of romance. Much could be said of the romantic character of the men of the Revolution, but let us look only at that of Washington. He was a perfect character of romance and chivalry in its highest sense. Nor were those traits of his character, which in the common estimate might pass for prosaic and purely matter-of-fact, at all at variance with his more shining qualities. His strict sense of justice, his systematic disposition of his time, his rigid determination on all occasions to claim what was due to him, his willingness to give that only which he had a right to give, his sense of religious obligation, his deference to the world's well-ascertained proprieties—all these were as much parts of his high chivalric bearing as was the dignity of his personal appearance, surpassed by no knight of real or fictitious chivalry, the daring gallantry of his

spirit, his quick, impetuous temper, or any other trait that poetry more readily consecrates.

A comparison has often been made by able hands between Washington and that fierce creation that sprang from the caldron of revolutionary France—Napoleon Bonaparte. It would be in vain even to attempt to retouch these contrasted portraits, but taking the record of their lives in our hands, let us be attentive to its last page—a page of deep and touching interest—the record of their death, for the death of each was a characteristic comment of his life. The one an illustration of all the gentle virtues which constituted his heroism; the other a fit farewell to a life of storm and tumult. The one that may not inaptly be likened to the last anchorage of some war-worn frigate, whose broad ensign has floated o'er many a just battle; the other the shipwreck of a private cruiser, whose flag has been long an emblem of terror to a peaceful world, whose decks are stained with blood, and at the height of the tempest founders on some obscure rock in the centre of an ocean's desolation.

Washington died on his own farm in the centre of the land to which he more than any other had given freedom and peaceful independence. The simple narrative of the details of his death, as preserved by his secretary, is beautifully characteristic, and so well known that it need but be referred to. The spirit of Washington returned to the power that gave it with neither agony of mind or body. His last accents breathed gratitude to all around him and peace and good will to men. As his noble figure lay on its last pillow, it lay in sweet repose, wasted by no long disease, deformed by no fierce convulsions. It was a scene of sorrow, but a scene of peace.

What a contrast to this gentle death was the last hour of Napoleon's trial. Darker and more tumultuous was the Imperial exile's death. "Head of my army," were the last words which escaped his lips, intimating that his thoughts were watching the current of a heavy fight. He who thought to conquer Europe found a prison in which to die. In the evening, desolate, surrounded by a surging sea, in the midst of a storm of wind and rain, the elements themselves in strife, in a whirlwind of delirium Napoleon's spirit took its flight.

It would require a volume in which to point out the many picturesque incidents of the American Revolution, for in its aggregate and in its details it was romantic. It was the effort of a dependent people to stand by itself, to govern itself. It involved a long and unequal contest, the desolation of many a field of prosperous industry, the sacrifice of many a cherished life. But it involved no wanton desolation; it was a war of defence; it was a war

for home. There was no fanaticism, there was no persecution, there was no scaffold. There was throughout the high dignity of that character peculiar to our Revolutionary forefathers, and embellished by the gentler grace which the refining spirit of the age hung around it.

The soil we stand on is filled with the bones of those who lived for us—the spirits of the mighty dead are above us and about us. The object of their trials, the recompense of their sufferings, was our Union. To perpetuate that Union, to save it from danger, let it come from what source it may, let us remember the beautiful in our history, and the righteousness of our existence as a nation; let us hang on the Union's sacred walls and stand on its noble porticos the pictures of the romantic deeds and the statues of the men who performed them. In imperishable records let their just praises be written, and then, when the agent of faction or mistaken zeal shall broach his calculations of the Union's value, or the Constitution's obligation, let him be led thither, and while he kneels in veneration, some interceding spirit must prompt him to carve on the arch of the Union, *Esto perpetua*.

DAVIS BRODHEAD

THE FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS

For the forty-first time within the past eighty years a report is presented in Congress in favor of the settlement of the French Spoliation Claims. "These remarkable claims," as they are characterized by the Senate Committee, have perhaps ceased to be remarkable in themselves, and become so because of the fact indicated that after repeated public acknowledgments of their justice, and repeated recommendations for their adjudication, they still remain unpaid.

Except to the claimants concerned, the history of the claims is pretty much a forgotten chapter. Singularly enough the very treaty of alliance with France which weighed so heavily in our favor during the war of the Revolution, became, less than twenty years later, during the wars of the French Revolution, a burden, vexation, and source of anxiety to us. By one of the articles of that treaty, the United States guaranteed, in case of any future rupture between France and Great Britain, to secure to the former her possessions in the West Indies, this being one of the considerations on which France on her part guaranteed the sovereignty and independence of the United States. The French Revolution followed, and France seized the cargoes and vessels of neutrals, Americans among them, in con-

sequence of England's attempt to stop all traffic with French ports. When the United States complained, and presented claims for damage done to her private shipping, France presented the counter-claim that our Government had failed to observe the treaty of Alliance of 1778, not only in not attempting to defend the French West Indies, but also by actually declaring itself neutral in the contest between Republican France and the monarchies of Europe. In September, 1800, the dispute was finally settled by offsetting these claims against each other—France agreeing to release the United States from the onerous obligations of the treaty of 1778, and the United States releasing France from the payment of the claims for captured vessels and cargoes. By this arrangement, the United States herself assumed the debt due by France to the owners of the despoiled vessels and cargoes in question, and she continues to this day to remain their debtor. The descendants of these owners are before the present Congress as the original claimants stood before the early sessions of Congress, from eighty to sixty years ago, petitioning for the payment of the claims.

Among the reports presented to Congress, the one drawn up by Charles Sumner in 1864 is exhaustive of the subject, and it is reprinted as an appendix of the report now before the Senate. The whole question is there discussed with great clearness and ability, and the obligation of the United States to the petitioners reaffirmed in unequivocal terms. A point of practical moment concerns the amount for which the Government may be liable. Senator Sumner looked into this matter carefully, and ascertained that there were eight hundred and ninety-eight vessels included in the claims from which France was released prior to 1801, the value of which was officially estimated in 1799 at \$20,000,000.

Notwithstanding the numerous favorable reports made, twice only have bills been passed by Congress for the payment of the claims, one of which was vetoed by President Polk, and the other by President Pierce. The present Senate bill provides for "the ascertainment of all the facts in the controversy, and a settlement of all the questions of law arising by the Court of Claims, with a right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States." The objections against the payment, as given in the vetoes and adverse minority reports, are that the claims are stale; that at the time they arose there was war between France and the United States, and that they have been embraced in subsequent settlements and conventions.

REPRINTS

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICAN PRISONERS IN ENGLAND DURING THE REVOLUTION

The facts brought out in the following discussion in the British House of Lords might never have come to the notice of the writer, had not ex-Governor Horatio Seymour placed in his hands a copy of *The New York Packet and the American Advertiser*, published at Fishkill, N. Y., Oct. 25, 1781. The paper also contains a long official report from Gen. Nathaniel Greene, of the recent victory at Eutaw Springs, with details of casualties in the several regiments under his command; cheering letters from Virginia, giving accounts of some of the successes of the allied forces at Yorktown; an account of the celebration at Peekskill, October 18th, of the anniversary of the surrender of Burgoyne; an epistle in poetry purporting to be from Gen. Burgoyne, in his dilemma at Yorktown, to Sir Henry Clinton; several items of news from Europe for May and June, and several quaint and curious advertisements.

From the report of the proceedings in the House of Lords, July 2, 1781, it seems that on June 29th Messrs. Lullman and Farquharson had been examined at the bar of the House of Commons on "the Petition of the American Prisoners confined in the Mill Prison at Plymouth," that Mr. Fox had moved in the Lower House for an address to his Majesty that the American prisoners be placed upon the same footing as the French, Spanish, and Dutch prisoners.

July 2, this subject being the order of the day: "The Duke of Richmond then rose and said that he would trouble their

Lordships with a few words, and but very few on the occasion before them. He would address himself merely to the feelings and the compassion of the House, for it was on that only that the true merits of the case depended. It had come out, even in the partial proof which they had heard at the bar, that the American prisoners had a smaller allowance of bread by one-third than the French, Spanish, and Dutch prisoners. Without entering into the politics of the question, or paying any regard to the particular situation in which these people stood, he would beg the House to consider and to treat them as men, as fellow-creatures, suffering the calamities of close confinement. He called upon them to say whether there was any sound and sober reason why the wants, the appetites, the necessities of an American should be less than those of a French man, a Spaniard, or a Dutch man? If not, was it either consistent with humanity, or with the national character, that an invidious distinction should be made with regard to them and to them only? How different was this from the conduct of the nation in the last war! At that time the glory which we acquired did not so much depend on the achievements of our arms as on the distinguished humanity with which we treated the prisoners that fell into our power. The example that we set forced from the gratitude and justice of our enemies the most honorable testimony of our conduct. The most eminent and venerable officers of France spoke of our behavior in terms of commendation and rapture, and by this the name and glory of the nation was exalted to a higher station of grandeur than it could have been elevated

by the triumphs of conquest. If this, then, was the line which we so successfully pursued, which may be said to be if not the natural, at least the frequent enemies of Great Britain, how much more did it become us, both from tenderness and policy, to exhibit proofs of national magnanimity in favor of those people in whom we once delighted, and whom we now wish to call our fellow-subjects? It was by this that we could hope to conciliate and reunite the affections of this country and America.

"Perhaps some noble Lords might be inclined to call them, as one of the witnesses at the bar had done, Rebels. Others might say, and he would be one of the number, that they were fighting for freedom and for the constitution. He would not, however, enter into this, nor would he trouble the House by entering into so minute a discussion of the question as he had intended, but since that time the same matter had been taken up in another place, and from the issue of the business there, he was able to form a pretty accurate presentment of the conclusion here. The Minister had set himself in opposition to it, and from the observation which he had been able to make of the system which he had, without success, resisted for the last fifteen or sixteen years, he was convinced that what the Minister thought proper to refuse in the Lower House, would not be granted in this. The reason, then, why he had brought forward this business, and why, having brought it forward, he thought it proper to say so little on the subject, was that, considering the matter as a question of humanity, he had brought it forward in the confidence which

he had in the feelings and the generosity of their Lordships, and now he said so little because from the issue of the matter in another House, he knew that there was no prospect of succeeding in this, and therefore it would be idle to give their Lordship's much trouble on the occasion. He therefore said he would conclude with saying that he wished to move for an address to his Majesty, to place them on the same footing as the prisoners of France, Spain, and Holland. He paid a very warm encomium on the liberal conduct of the Commissioners of sick and hurt, and said that from their behavior in a recent instance, in which he had been applied to by the Dutch to enquire into the situation of their prisoners, they had shown the most honorable inclination to do everything in their power to provide for the accommodation of the prisoners of war. But at the same time they had themselves proved that the American prisoners had an inferior allowance of bread, the most essential requisite for the support of life. A noble Lord (Lord Abbingdon) had suggested a wish that the motion might be delayed. If there was any reason for this he would very cheerfully comply with his Lordship and the House in that respect.

"Lord Abbingdon said that he considered the Americans as illegally confined, and he wished to see that question inquired into; there were no other reasons that he had for wishing the noble Duke to delay his motion.

"The Duke of Richmond then moved for an address to his Majesty, similar to that moved for by Mr. Fox in the Lower House.

"Lord Sandwich opposed it, on the

ground of the evidence given at the bar, by which it appears that the Americans had a sufficient allowance of wholesome, nourishing provisions, and that they had continued in a state of remarkable health for a period of four years. He said that they had more than the soldiers on board the transports, and it would be therefore a great injustice to that valuable body of men to agree to the address proposed. Nor was the provision of the general body of labourers throughout the kingdom in any respect equal to the allowance made to these people.

"The Earl of Coventry and Earl Ferris supported the motion on principles of humanity, and declared that they considered it at once as impolitic and disgraceful to make a distinction of the nature that was made in this instance, since it tended to exasperate and to widen the breach between this country and America.

"Lord Loughborough opposed the motion, and defended the allowances that were made in the case of the French, Spanish, and Dutch prisoners, and of American and British prisoners, on physical principles. He said that it was necessary to proportion the allowance made to men in prison to what they were accustomed by their habits of living in general. To give them a greater quantity would subject them to disease—or to give them less—or to give them a change of diet. In France they were in the habit of eating much more bread than they did in this country. Mr. Howard, in his account of the prisons, said that the common fixed allowance was a pound and a half of bread. In England, the common average provision to the prisoners in the several county gaols was

one pound of bread per man per day. The noble Lord drew from this conclusion that the provision to the American prisoners ought to be in the same proportion.

"The Duke of Richmond answered the learned Lord with great success. He said he had not answered the plain question which he had asked, and which was the immediate point in issue, whether the appetites of an American were less than those of a Frenchman? Unless he proved this he proved nothing. He had been led, as well as the witness at the bar, his countryman, to make an estimate of the wants and necessities of the people of this country, by a comparison of what was required for subsistence in that part of the kingdom. He thought that the conclusion was not just. The people in that part of the country, the labourers of the lowest sort, had more than a pound of bread per day, and he therefore thought that the argument, coming as it did from persons who could not judge of this country but from their knowledge of that, did not and ought not to weigh. The learned Lord had misrepresented one fact, that the average allowance of bread to prisoners in the county gaols was one pound of bread per man per day. He knew that in several counties it was otherwise. In Sussex, they were allowed two pounds of bread per day.

"Lord Loughborough spoke again and stated several counties in which he knew the allowance was one pound per day. In regard to the observations which the noble Duke had made on Scotland and oatmeal, he could only say, that when he stooped to such an argument, he placed

him, inferior as he was, in a state so much above him that he disdained all reply.

"The Duke of Richmond said that the noble Lord's disdain, or his respect, was to him a matter of the most perfect indifference. He might either disdain to reply or choose to speak, just as he pleased. He might sit down with a flourish instead of an argument, and might, without reason, take offence at an assertion because he did not find it convenient to give a direct answer. Great orators made it a practice when an argument touched them to leave it unanswered, and this the noble Lord had done. He had not attempted an answer to the simple question which he had asked, on which all the subject depended, but he had misconstrued an observation into an attack against Scotland. He was above the meanness of a national reflection—but he had said, and still maintained it, that a Scotchman was not a proper judge of an Englishman's stomach.

"The House divided on the motion :

"Contents..... 14

"Non-contents..... 47"

So it seems that the humane proposition of the Duke of Richmond respecting the starving Americans, prisoners of war in the terrible "Mill prison," was voted down.

M. M. J.

UTICA, N. Y.

THE TRACK OF THE NORSEMAN

[This is a monograph, by Jos. Story Fay, of "Wood's Holl," Massachusetts. So far as the words "Holl" and "Hole" appear to be concerned, there is little or nothing in it, yet it is reproduced here to show what the author thinks, as writers who interest themselves in such mat-

ters have a right to be heard. A tolerable exhibition of cartology would be sufficient to dissipate the notion that "Hole" is a relic of the Scandinavian visits to this region, which, no doubt, were made, the fact being one that no Newport windmills or Dighton rocks can ever dissipate; the accounts of the Sagas pointing definitely to the mild climate of the coast of Rhode Island. The Sagas stand in no need of vindication so far as windmills, pictured rock, "*eykts*," and philological discussions may be concerned.]

It is now well established that in the tenth century the Norsemen visited this country, and coasting down from Greenland, passed along Cape Cod, through Vineyard Sound to Narragansett Bay, where it is believed they settled. In the neighborhood of Assonet and Dighton inscriptions upon the rocks have been found and traditions exist that there were others which have been destroyed. The name of Mount HOPE is supposed to have been given to the Indians by them, and it is a little curious that those antiquaries, who have tried to identify the names in Narragansett Bay with the Norsemen, did not look elsewhere on their route.

The Rev. Isaac Taylor, the author of a work published by Macmillan & Co., of London, entitled "Words and Places," dilates upon the tenacity with which the names of places adhere to them, "throwing light upon history when other records are in doubt." He shows the progress and extent of the Celtic, Norwegian, and Saxon migration over Europe, by the names and terminals which still exist

over that continent and even on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea, and says, "the knowledge of the history and migrations of such tribes must be recovered from the study of the names of the places they once inhabited, but which now know them no more; from the names of the hills which they fortified, of the rivers by which they dwelt, of the distant mountains upon which they gazed." He says, "In the Shetlands, every local name without exception is Norwegian. The names of the farms end in —seter or —ster, and the hills are called —hoy and —holl;" and yet he also says, "the name of Greenland is the only one left to remind us of the Scandinavian settlements which were made in America in the tenth century." Would the author have made this exception to his axiom as to the durability of names had he remembered that the Norsemen called the southern coast of Massachusetts VINELAND, and then had seen that we still have "Martin's" or "Martha's VINEYARD?" Had he sighted Cape Cod and entered Vineyard Sound as the Northmen did, in rounding Monomoy Point, the southeast extremity of the cape, he would have seen on his right a high sandy hill, on or near which is the lighthouse, overlooking a land-locked anchorage on the inside, called Powder Hole; a score or more of miles further along, across the sound on his left, he would have seen the hills now called Oak Bluffs and the Highlands, and under their lee, a deep bay and roadstead long known as Holmes' Hole, unfortunately changed to Vineyard Haven; crossing over to the main-land again, a little further west, he would have come to the

bold but prettily rounded hills forming the southwestern extremity of the cape, and behind them, the sheltered and picturesque harbor of Wood's Hole.

Proceeding thence toward Narragansett Bay, along the south coast of Nauset, prominent hills on the west end of that Island slope down to a roadstead for small craft, and a passage through to Buzzard's Bay, called Robinson's Hole: —the next island is Pasque, and between its high hills and those of Nashawena, is a passage called Quick's Hole. Now these several localities are unlike each other except that all have hills in their vicinity, serving as distinguishing landmarks. Why is not the word Hole, as applied to them, a corruption of the Norwegian word Holl, meaning hill? The descriptive term Hole is not applicable to any of them, but the word Holl is to the adjacent hills, while there is little else in common between them. The localities now called Quick's and Robinson's Hole are passages between Elizabeth Islands. Wood's Hole is a passage and a harbor, Holmes' Hole, now known as Vineyard Haven, is a deep bay or anchorage, and Powder Hole was formerly a capacious roadstead, now nearly filled with sand.

It may seem to militate with the theory advanced, that south of Powder Hole or Monomoy Point, is a locality called on the chart Butler's Hole, which lies in the course from Handkerchief Shoal to Pollock Rip, where there is now not only no hill, but no land. But it is to be considered that almost within the memory of man there was land in that vicinity, which has been washed away by the same strong and eccentric current that has nearly filled up Powder Hole harbor

and made it a sand-flat, and which still casts up on the shore large roots and remains of trees. With this in mind it is not wild to suppose that Butler's Hole marks a spot where once was an island with a prominent hill, which the sea-kings called a Holl, and which has succumbed to the powerful abrasion of the tides which have moved Pollock Rip many yards to the eastward, and which every year make and unmake shoals in the vicinity of Nantucket and Cape Cod.

It would seem a matter of course that the Norsemen, after their long and perhaps rough voyages, when once arrived in the sheltered waters and harbors of Vineyard Sound, should have become familiar with them and should have lingered there to recruit and refit, before proceeding westward; or, on their return, to have waited there to gather up resources before venturing out on the open ocean. Indeed, it is recorded in their sagas that they brought off boat loads of grapes from those pleasant shores. What more probable than that they cultivated friendly relations with the natives, and in coming to an understanding with them on subjects in common, should have told them the Norwegian terms for the hills and headlands of their coast, and that the Indians, in the paucity of their own language, should have adopted the appellative Holl, which they were told signified hill, so important as a landmark to these wandering sea-kings! Why may not the Northmen have called them so, until the natives adopted the same title, and handed it down to the English explorers under Bartholomew Gosnold, who gave their own patronymics to those several Holls, or Holes as now called? The

statement of "the oldest inhabitant" of Wood's Hole, on being asked where the word Hole came from, is, that he "always understood that it came from the Indians."

There being no harbor on the shores of Martha's Vineyard island west of Holmes' Hole, the voyagers would naturally follow the north shore of the Sound and become familiar with the Elizabeth Islands, and be more likely to give names to the localities on that side than on the other. Between Wood's Hole and Holmes' Hole the Sound is narrowest, and they would be apt to frequent either harbor as the winds and tide might make it safe and convenient for them.

It seems to confirm the views here advanced that in no other part of this Continent or of the world, where the English have settled, is to be commonly found the local name of Hole, and yet here in a distance of sixty miles, the thoroughfare of these bold navigators, there are no less than five such still extant. How can it be explained except because it is "the track of the Norseman?" It is not natural or probable, with their imperfect means of navigation, that they should have passed from Greenland to Narragansett Bay, leaving distinct traces in each, and yet to have ignored the whole intervening space, and not to have lingered awhile on the shores where they found grapes by the boat load, and which must have been as fair and pleasant in those days as they are now. It is to be hoped that, at least, our people will not be in haste to wipe out the local names of Vineyard Sound, when it is so likely that they are the oldest on the Continent and give to Massachusetts a priority of dis-

covery and settlement over her sister States. Only let us correct the spelling, and give proper significance to them by calling the places now named HOLE by the appropriate title of HOLL.¹

NOTES

TEXAS AND TYLER—The somewhat lengthy article in the present number of the *MAGAZINE* treats of the times when politics *were* politics, when presidential campaigns were not colorless in respect to principles, and when the difference between the parties was not indicated chiefly by the proportions of vituperation and personal abuse which they respectively employed. There were excellent haters in those days, but there were also fundamental questions affecting the life of the nation, concerning which the best minds entertained widely conflicting views. Our leading article, written by the son of the late President Tyler, is a reminiscence of those days, and possesses a special value, inasmuch as it is the work of an ablegate, fully qualified to speak his principal's mind. It, however, does not present any flattering view of the power of human discernment, where Calhoun appears urging "the peculiar institution" as essential to the welfare of the South, and, indeed, of the whole nation; nor where Tyler maintains that the same institution is "a matter of climate." They forget that it was human institutions that were so poorly regulated. Hence, though hardly a generation has passed, their

views on that subject have been reduced to rubbish, while the Republic survives.

PROGRESS AND PREJUDICE—A Magazine of American History cannot fulfil its mission, if the management is contented by making it a repository of unsifted material and verbose documents. There are two antiquities, a past and a future, as extremes meet; and historical research has a double value, in that out of the dusky past it affords light for days to come. That antiquary presents a pitiable figure who adores the past, because it is the past. Antiquarian and historic research should have a direct bearing upon present and coming issues, and thus yield a fair proportion of useful results. The study of history is essential to progress, yet how poor will be the progress when this study is prosecuted under the influence of prejudice. National prejudice is sufficiently deleterious, but local, provincial prejudice is worse. National prejudice may, possibly, be dignified in some degree by patriotism, but provincial prejudice is belittling and every way small. It too often concerns itself with the honor of historic actions that were essentially dishonorable; suppresses or ignores unwelcome truth, defends whatever is peculiar to the bailiwick, and regards those who presumed to have any unpleasantness therewith as hopelessly bad. This spirit might adorn the Pickwickian author of a monograph on the source of Hampstead Ponds, but it can confer no special benefit upon the sources of history. It must be obvious to well-ordered minds that, so far as possible, prejudice, whether national or local, alike demands elimination; for it is

¹ It is natural that the English having no word spelled *Holl* (pronounced like roll, toll, poll, knoll, etc.), should spell the word from its phonetic sound *Hole*, though its meaning is *Hill*.

hardly to the credit of the country that we should even be obliged to look to the Libittinarii for that relief so reasonably expected from historians.

MOULTRIE AND GADSDEN — E. S. Thomas, in his "Reminiscences of the Last Sixty-five Years" (Hartford, 1840), says: "Among the eminent men of Charleston, S. C., in those days [1795-1800], besides the Rutledges and Pinckneys, already mentioned, were Generals Moultrie and Gadsden. Each of those veterans of the Revolution were, I should think, upwards of seventy when I first saw them. Moultrie was not more celebrated for his bravery and skill in war, than for all those virtues that adorn the domestic circle in peace. He was the best company of any man I ever saw of his years, and could set the table in a roar whenever it suited him. The old loved, the young venerated and respected him. He was a great favorite with the ladies, whose faithful admirer and most chivalrous defender he had ever been. General Gadsden was his senior. I saw only enough of him to learn to appreciate him as a soldier of the Revolution, and a patriotic and most enterprising citizen."

THE WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS at Tappan, Westchester County, New York, was built in 1700, and partly of materials brought from Holland. When occupied by Washington during the Revolution, it was owned by Johannes De Wint, a West India planter. The parlor in which was signed the death-warrant of André, and which was the office of Washington, was decorated with eighty-nine Dutch tiles,

about five inches square, and on them were represented as many subjects taken from Scriptures or the Apocrypha. They are painted in one color—purple, on a white ground, and some of them, by their grotesqueness, give proof of their Teutonic origin. For example, the whale that swallowed Jonah is pictured as holding the prophet by his waistband, and the sight is not suggestive of serious thoughts. For some reason these tiles have recently been removed, and are not now accessible to the student in pottery.

CUSH

THE FIRST LION IN THE UNITED STATES —The first lion put in an appearance in America in 1796. This noble animal, according to the advertisement, was caught in the woods of Goree, in Africa, when a whelp, and brought thence to New York. He was between three and four feet high, measured eight feet from nostrils to tail, was of a beautiful dun color. He was between six and seven years old when he emigrated, and was "uncommonly strong built." His legs and tail were as thick as those of a common sized ox. He is described as tame as any domestic animal. This "beautiful" creature was exhibited at "the Ball Alley in the Fields [now the City Hall Park] next the corner of Murray's Street in Broadway." S.

THE FIRST AMERICAN CARGO OF COTTON TO ENGLAND—This important initiative of "King Cotton's" rule in the foreign commerce of the United States was made by Captain Robert Sheffield, of Fairfield, Ct., an uncle of the late Mr. Joseph E.

Sheffield, the venerable and liberal founder of the Yale College "Sheffield Scientific School." As early as the beginning of the present century, in his ship "Sovereign," of 220 tons, he took out 450 bales from Charleston, S C., touching at the port of New York, and clearing for Liverpool, his cargo covering the deck of his vessel, from stint of hold-room. On arrival at Liverpool, the dealers would not at first believe that his cotton was from this country, so that he was obliged to *bond* it, until he could obtain a formal consular certificate. Captain Robert Sheffield afterward built the "Mars," and made this vessel the first Liverpool packet from New York.

This eminent shipmaster of the olden time, who had also signalized himself during the Revolutionary War in the United States naval service, lived to the age of ninety-four, and ended his long life very peacefully about 1836, at the Sailor's Snug Harbor, where his friends persuaded him, toward the last, to spend his remaining old age. These facts we have recently received from his now only surviving nephew, Captain Pascal Sheffield, of Southport, Conn., who, some fifty years since, took out the first load of cotton from Apalachicola to Liverpool, in his good ship "Warsaw." He then met with merchants who remembered his pioneer uncle above mentioned.

W. H.

THE NEWBURG CENTENNIAL — If the expectations of the citizens of Newburg, N. Y., are fully realized, the series of centennial celebrations will be rounded off in that place next year in a fitting and bril-

liant manner. At Newburg Washington had his last headquarters; there the cessation of hostilities with Great Britain was publicly proclaimed; there Washington restrained his officers from committing an enormous blunder in threatening Congress for its apparant neglect of them; there he nipped in the bud the project of making him Dictator; and there the grand old army of the Revolution—that depleted but indomitable, long-suffering, victorious body—was disbanded. Next spring and fall there will be much to recall in the way of Newburg associations. The question now is to provide ample means and in ample time for the celebration. It has not yet been determined what day in the year to celebrate as a general jubilee, since several events are to be commemorated at the same time, but as a centennial memorial it is proposed to erect at Washington's headquarters, on the bluff overlooking the river, a plain shaft or column with inscriptions respecting the most important incidents occurring at that point. It is proposed further to erect a building or "temple" similar to that which the Revolutionary soldiers built for the peace festivities, and to purchase and keep in order adjacent grounds in which many of the veterans, dying in camp, were buried. The city of Newburg has already appropriated \$5,000 for the expenses and the citizens promise \$5,000 more, while Congress is asked, as stated in the April number of the MAGAZINE, p. 291, to make an appropriation both for the monument and celebration. The sum proposed in the House resolution is \$25,000.

After the Newburg festivities comes the evacuation of New York by the British, which will be duly observed.

QUERIES

FRENCH EXILES—When Chevalier John Keating came to Philadelphia from France, after the execution of Louis XVI., he was accompanied by some thirty of the French nobility. Did they settle there permanently, and what is their history? Keating, who lived to an advanced age, died at Philadelphia in 1856.

ARMOR

CHARLES BLASKOWITZ—What is known of this individual, whose name appears as the author of several Revolutionary maps? Was he an engineer-officer, and in what service, British or Hessian? Some of his work displays much skill and accuracy.

SELDEN

THE NEW ROAD, NEW YORK—There are certain manuscript references which make mention of a redoubt at the "New Road in New York," during the British occupation, 1781. Information is sought respecting this road. Can it be located?

*

THE CHESSY CAT—What is the origin of the saying, "Grin like a chessey cat"? Has "chessey" anything to do with "Chester"?

CHAT

THE CARDINAL OF BOURBON—Who was "the cardinall of Burbon," mentioned in the Maine Collections [series 2, vol. II., p. 26] as sending Stephen Bel-linger, of Rouen, into the region of Massachusetts Bay, in 1583; and what were the relations of the men of Rouen to the New England coast in the sixteenth century?

DIEPPE

GATES' "NORTHERN LAURELS" AND "SOUTHERN WILLOWS"—What is the best authority for the statement that Lee cautioned Gates on his way to the Southern department, to beware lest he exchanged his "Northern laurels for Southern willows"? Colonel Peter Horry gives the story as follows:

On his way from the Northern States General Gates passed through Fredericksburg, where he fell in with General Charles Lee, who, in his frank manner, asked him where he was going.

"Why, to take Cornwallis."

"I am afraid," quoth Lee, "you will find him a tough piece of English beef."

"Tough, sir," replied Gates, "tough! then begad I'll tender him. I'll make *piloo* of him, sir, in three hours after I set eyes upon him."

"Aye! will you indeed?" returned Lee. "Well then send for me, and I will help you eat him."

Gates smiled, and bidding him adieu, rode off. Lee bawled after him, "Take care, Gates! take care! or your Northern laurels will degenerate into Southern willows."—*Life of Marion*.

THE KOSCIUSKO SCHOOL—In the report of the Board of Managers of the American Colonization Society for 1827, occurs the following paragraph: "The Managers have heard with pleasure that an institution, denominated the Kosciusko School, has been founded in New Jersey, and that one of its prominent objects is to qualify young men of color for usefulness in Liberia. The name of Kosciusko is associated with this school, in honor of that illustrious individual who, on his final departure from America, in-

trusted to Mr. Jefferson a fund to be applied by him to the purchase and education of African slaves, which fund is, on certain conditions, to be appropriated to the benefit of this seminary, which will long stand, we trust, a monument of the charity of that noble foreigner, whose valor and services in the cause of freedom and humanity, are revered throughout our country and the civilized world."

Where was this school located and what its history? T.

REPLIES

ETHAN ALLEN AND SIR HENRY CLINTON [VIII. 221]—Whatever *proof* there may be of Allen's having ever entertained treasonable purposes—and after all my reading of Allen's history, I know of none—Sir Henry Clinton's note certainly cannot be so classed. Clinton is simply stating in a memorandum of mere reports about the American Army, "by the best accounts Ethan Allen has not yet joined, tho' much discontented." Joined what? Presumably the English Army. At this time, January, 1781, Allen was not in military service, having retired from it discontented. Why? The Vermont Assembly, October 30, 1781, had instructed him to negotiate an exchange of prisoners with the British Commander Haldeman, and then "to discharge the volunteers raised for the defence of the frontier." Allen obeyed, whereupon Captains Hutchins and Hathaway preferred charges against him. The Assembly listened to the charges and summoned him to appear. Allen appeared, answered the charges, and re-

signed his commission. The Assembly subsequently considered the charges, and on the testimony of two of Allen's staff officers—Stephen A. Bradley and Joseph Fay, men distinguished in State affairs as of undoubted patriotism and probity—*dismissed* the charges, appointed a committee to return to Allen "the thanks of this house for the great service he has done the State since his appointment of Brigadier-General," and accepted his resignation. These charges against him for *obeying the orders* of the Assembly, and their *consideration by* the Assembly, naturally caused his "discontent." The same Assembly re-elected him Brigadier-General of the First Brigade five months later, April 11, 1781, and two months after Clinton records the above *hearsay*. This reappointment, as Mr. Gilman says, Allen "declined to accept, but with the promise that he would render any service desired of him at any time, although not formally commissioned; and that promise was faithfully observed." As soon as Allen was reappointed and had declined, he offered his military service to one who certainly had no kind feelings toward him—the Governor of New York. 'Again, supposing Clinton to refer to a hoped-for union of Allen with the British, like his estimate of the purpose for which the Pennsylvania line mutinied, the wish was, in Clinton, father to the hearsay he recorded. The Pennsylvania emeute occurring at this time gave Clinton high hopes of securing several thousand "discontented" American troops to his own army; but his hopes were dashed by the indignant act of the "discontented" in lynching his emissaries. It were as just to suspect

these soldiers of treason on account of their mutiny, as to suspect Allen of treason on the mere *hearsay* memorandum of Clinton. If Allen was a traitor, or even entertained the toryism which he charges, it is believed unjustly, on his brother Levi—let us have the *proof*.

HORACE EDWIN HAYDEN

WESLEY AS A BISHOP [VIII. 227]—There is not the slightest evidence that John Wesley ever received Episcopal consecration. On the contrary, writing to Coke while the latter was in America, about 1785, he says: "One instance of this, of your *greatness*, has given me great concern. How can you, how dare you, suffer yourself to be called *Bishop*? I shudder, I start at the very thought! Men may call *me* a knave or a fool, a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content, but they shall never, by my consent, call me *Bishop*!" (See Whitehead's "Life of Wesley," p. 17, ed. 1845.) In the same work (prepared by Rev. John Whitehead, M.D., Wesley's *literary executor*, to whom he willed all his papers for this purpose), vol. ii., p. 291, the author says that "some years ago" (he wrote in the last century) "Erasmus, Bishop of Crete, visited London, driven from his see by the Turks for baptizing a Mussulman into the faith of Christ. That the known liberality of Mr. Wesley should induce him to be kind to a stranger in distress is not to be wondered at, but the report circulated in some periodical publications of that time, that Mr. Charles Wesley had offered him forty guineas to consecrate his brother a bishop, is totally without foundation, and has not even the shadow of probability to give it

credit." However, some of the followers of Wesley, who have the "Apostolic Succession" bee in their bonnet, have taken up the matter seriously, and discussed it. Coke, who was a contemporary of Whitehead and Wesley, did not credit the story, as the letter he wrote to Bishop White requesting consecration (he being already a Presbyterian of the Church of England) is still in the archives of the Protestant Episcopal Church (see White's "Memoirs," 3d ed., p. 408 et seq.). I think some discussion of this matter will be found in Tyermore's "Wesley," Stevens' "Methodism," "The Southern Review," and Whitehead's "Life of Wesley," republished by Rev. Thomas H. Stockton, 1845, and now scarce.

HORACE EDWIN HAYDEN

THE MAYFLOWER [VIII. 293]—This flower is in its prime in the Middle States in May, and not in April, as in Massachusetts, and so valuable an authority as Gray states that it derives its colloquial name from the month of May, in which it blooms so bountifully. It is called throughout Pennsylvania and Maryland "the trailing arbutus." WILKES

COST OF THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR TO FRANCE [VIII. 294]—The treaty between Louis XVI. of France and the United States, February 6, 1778, was a most important factor in producing the subsequent bankruptcy of France. The empire was fearfully in debt when this treaty was made, and the war to which it gave rise cost France, according to Audouin, 1,400,000,000 livres—nearly \$300,000,000 of our money. While this enormous

drain was exhausting rapidly the resources of France, the insane extravagance of the Court did not cease nor abate. Necker, who was ever wide awake to the financial dangers of the kingdom, plead in vain, and was dismissed on account of his remonstrance.

The peace of 1783 gave but a brief respite to already insolvent France. Calonne followed Necker as Minister of Finance. His efforts to stay the rushing tide were no more successful. February 22, 1787, the deficit in the treasury was estimated at about 150,000,000 livres—\$30,000,000. When Necker was recalled, this same year, he found in cash in the treasury of France 419,000 livres—\$83,800. The efforts to remedy this terrible bankruptcy resulted, July, 1789, in the French Revolution. Whether this was the *immediate* result of the American Revolutionary War, or of the mad craze for pleasure which wasted the revenues of the empire *at home*, each one can decide for himself.

HORACE EDWIN HAYDEN

COST OF THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR TO FRANCE [VIII. 294]—According to the report of Calonne, Minister of Finance to Louis XVI., France expended fourteen hundred and forty millions of francs, or about two hundred and eighty millions of dollars, in assisting the Colonies during the Revolutionary War. Jefferson states in his Memoirs that Necker reported the same figures at the opening of the States-General at Paris in 1789. *

THE GRAHAMS—On this subject [VIII. 206] I may say that the Rev. John Graham, of Suffield, kept a complete diary

with a record of births, deaths, and marriages of all within his precinct. This record, however, cannot now be found. General Lyman and the Rev. John Graham, of Suffield, were intimate friends, notwithstanding the strictures of the latter upon the former. The statements in Cothren's "Woodbury" need correction. The first John Graham had two wives. The first was Love Sanborn, December 14, 1719, by whom he had three children, Elizabeth, John, and Robert. She died March 1, 1726, while he was in Stafford, Conn. He soon after married Abigail Chauncy, who was the mother of the other children, among whom was John Graham, afterward of Suffield, who was born at Woodbury, where his parents resided at the time. CONNECTICUT

SALT RIVER [VIII. 297]—Webster's Dictionary, p. 1587, says: "The phrase '*To row up Salt River*' has its origin in the fact that there is a small stream of that name in Kentucky, the passage of which is made difficult and laborious as well by its tortuous course as by the abundance of shallows and bars. The real application of the phrase is to the unhappy wight who has the task of propelling the boat up the stream; but in political or slang usage it is to those who are rowed up.—*J. Inman.*" H.

EAGLES AND FISH HAWKS ON THE HUDSON—Under this title [VIII. 358] a contributor to the MAGAZINE describes the habits of birds on the Hudson in the last century. St. John de Crevecoeur, whose account is here recited, was the first French Consul at New York after the

peace. He had lived for many years in the New York Colony. In the Colonial Records of the Chamber of Commerce, in a note to a sketch of the Verplanck family by the late Gulian C. Verplanck, will be found an account of a scene which M. de Crevecoeur witnessed at the house of Mr. Samuel Verplanck, at Fish-kill, when the hawk took from the water a fish weighing twenty-one pounds, which was robbed from him by a bald eagle, who in turn, frightened by the cries of Mr. Verplanck, dropped the fish, which was served for dinner. Mr. Verplanck is credited with saying that these birds were his usual purveyors when he had a fancy for a fish dinner.

This fish story must be taken as the fish itself, "*cum grano salis*." Audubon confirms the habits of the white-headed eagle, king of birds, and the fish hawk or osprey, but in his account of the latter bird he says that the largest fish he had seen it take out of the water was a weak-fish, weighing somewhat over five pounds. The bird carried it with difficulty, and dropped it on hearing the report of a shot fired at it. This was at Great Egg Harbor, on the Jersey coast, where both birds and fish abound. The fish mentioned by Crevecoeur could not have been sea-bass, but what are now called striped-bass.

S.

—
 PORTRAIT OF GENERAL POOR [VIII. 294]—The only extant portrait of General Enoch Poor, of New Hampshire, who died in the Revolutionary service in 1780, while commanding one of the two brigades in Lafayette's Light Infantry Division, was drawn by Colonel Thaddeus Kosciuszko, on the fly-leaf of a

Common Prayer Book, during service. The Colonel presented the sketch to General Poor, who was unaware what his distinguished Polish friend was about. This souvenir is now carefully preserved by one of the General's descendants, and a copy of it is in my possession. The sketch was made in 1780. A. B. G.

—
 LOG CANOES [VIII. 340]—In reply to an inquiry regarding canoes, I will say, although aware that the old writers do not mention "dug-outs" as having been used by the Iroquois, that I have little doubt that they did, for the account which I give in my article is a well-authenticated family tradition, and is as reliable as anything which cannot actually be proved. Possibly in the pre-historic days they used nothing on the Mohawk but the elm-bark canoe, and they may have learned to make the dug-out from the whites, for this latter kind of canoe has continued to be in use here down to a late day—in fact, I remember some of them in my boyhood. S. L. FREY

—
 SHARPLES VERSUS HEATH—In the notice of the supposed Sharples portrait of Washington [VIII. 224], reference is made to a painting of "Stuyvesant's Army Entering Sing Sing." This is probably an error, and refers to a drawing made by William Heath, of London, which the Putnams reproduced in Knickerbocker's New York, editions of 1850 and 1867, of Stuyvesant Entering New York. The portrait of Washington was exhibited by Mr. Walters in the spring of 1854, not 1834. It was not accompanied by any other picture. W.

SOCIETIES

THE MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY met May 11th, Vice-President Ellis in the chair, when Mayor Green, the Librarian, made his monthly report, and the society proceeded to pay its respects to the memory of the late Ralph Waldo Emerson. Dr. Ellis was the first speaker, alluding first to the scene when, fifteen months ago, Mr. Emerson read before the society his paper upon Carlyle, the last that he ever read, and one which was prepared thirty years before, and saying that "it is no secret, but a free confession, that the quality, methods, and fruits of his genius are so peculiar, unique, obscure, and remote from the appreciation of a large class of those of logical, argumentative, and prosaic minds, as to invest them with the ill-understood and the inexplicable. He was signally one of those, rare in our race, in the duality of our human elementary composition, in whom the dust of the ground contributed its least proportions, while the ethereal inspiration from above contributed the greatest." The speaker also quoted from a letter by Emerson, who, in reply to a demand from a friend for arguments in support of his position, the need of arguments being felt by many who failed to be convinced by his semi-vaticinations, said, "It strikes me very oddly that good and wise men at Cambridge and Boston should think of raising me into an object of criticism. I have always been—from my very incapacity of methodical writing—'a chartered libertine,' free to worship and free to rail, lucky when I could make myself understood, but never esteemed near

enough to the institutions and mind of society to deserve the notice of the masters of literature and religion. I have appreciated fully the advantages of my position; for I well know that there is no scholar less able or willing to be a polemic. I could not give accounts of myself if challenged. I could not possibly give you one of the 'arguments' you cruelly hint at, on which any doctrine of mine stands; for I do not know what arguments mean, in reference to any expression of a thought. I delight in telling what I think; but, if you ask me how I dare say so, or why it is so, I am the most helpless of mortal men."

Judge E. R. Hoar wrote, saying, among other things, that Emerson's "address in September, 1835, at the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the settlement of Concord, seems to me to contain the most complete and exquisite picture of the origin, history, and peculiar characteristics of a New England town that has ever been produced."

Dr. O. W. Holmes spoke of "the loftiest and divinest of our thinkers," alluding elegantly to a class of those who reverently attended the obsequies of Emerson, as "the guardians of ancient formulæ, vigilant still as watch-dogs over the bones of their fleshless symbols;" also quoting the late Mr. Burlingame, who, after his return, said, "There are twenty thousand Ralph Waldo Emersons in China." James Freeman Clark also spoke.

It was announced by the Chair that the council had appointed Mr. James Russell Lowell to write a memoir of Mr. Longfellow for the society's proceedings. The appointment of the society's biographer

of Mr. Emerson was deferred till the next meeting. Dr. Holmes presented a deed of mortgage of a house in Northampton, England, dated 1683, in the handwriting and with the signature of Thomas Franklin, a relative of Benjamin Franklin. The deed was sent to Dr. Holmes by Mr. Bellows, of Gloucester, England, the author of the miniature French Dictionary. Professor C. E. Norton read two letters which he received about a year ago from Mr. Darwin, containing interesting facts about the friendship existing between Franklin and members of the Darwin family. Colonel Henry Lee spoke of a portrait at the State House, said to be that of Rev. Francis Higginson. After careful study and comparison with another possessing similar claims, it is believed that the one at the State House is an original. Dr. Ellis remarked that before the time of Blackburn and Smibert there must have been a portrait painter in Boston, as is proved by the existence of several well-authenticated portraits.

NEW ENGLAND HISTORIC, GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY—A stated meeting of this society was held May 4th. In the absence of the President, the Rev. Edmund F. Slafter took the chair.

The corresponding secretary announced several recent donations, namely, the seal of the extinct Middlesex Canal Company, an interesting relic of a corporation by which was constructed a work of internal improvement which, when it was finished, and for many years afterward, was considered a masterly piece of engineering, one of the wonders of the vicinity, presented by Mr. Robert H. Eddy, whose fa-

ther, Mr. Caleb Eddy, had charge of the canal for many years; a cane made from the "Old Elm" on Boston Common, blown down February 15, 1876, belonging to the late Mr. Henry W. Alger, of West Bridgewater.

Rev. Charles A. Downs, of Lebanon, N. H., read a paper entitled "A Border New Hampshire Town in the Vermont Controversy."

The subject is a difficult one, because of the number of the actors and variety of motives which influenced them. The motives are these: 1. Grievances, real and fancied. 2. Neighborly sympathy. 3. Self-interest. 4. Patriotism. 5. Policy, American and British.

Many of the earlier grants were given before much exploration had been made, so that different grants often overlapped. The Masonian grant of the territory of New Hampshire was bounded by a line sixty miles from the ocean. The commission of Benning Wentworth gave him jurisdiction over a much larger territory westward, till it met His Majesty's other governments. Massachusetts and Connecticut had established their western boundaries at a line twenty miles from the Hudson River; New Hampshire claimed the same line, and Governor Wentworth made many grants of townships in the present territory of Vermont, the first being Bennington, 1750. Charles II., by letters patent, had granted a territory to the Duke of York, whose eastern boundary was the Connecticut River. So New York also claimed the territory of Vermont. These rival claims became an element in the controversy. In 1764, upon the appeal of both provinces, the king decided that the west bank of the

Connecticut River should be the boundary between the two provinces. But upon the Revolution and the cessation of royal authority, New Hampshire laid claim to the territory of Vermont.

The people of Vermont, harassed by the agents of New York, declared their independence of all authority, and organized a State Government, 1777, and sought recognition from Congress and admission into the Union, New York openly opposing, because she claimed the territory as her own. In the meantime, certain towns of New Hampshire, in the valley of the Connecticut, dissatisfied with their relations to New Hampshire, conceiving themselves wronged and oppressed by that Government, accepted an invitation to unite with the people of the new State. New Hampshire alarmed at this loss of territory, entered her protest before Congress. New York did the same, and Congress, on that ground, refused to recognize the new State, declaring that Vermont must abandon all territory claimed by these States before she could even hope to be admitted to the Union as a sovereign State. The primary purpose of those at the head of the Government of Vermont was recognition as a State. This purpose was a dominant one, and overruled all other considerations. Finding that her admission of the New Hampshire towns stood in the way of this recognition, she indirectly dismissed them by refusing to give them certain privileges. The New Hampshire towns refused to return to their allegiance, because the grievances were still unredressed, and fell back upon their town organization and became "little sovereignties," claiming to administer all their affairs as

such, without interference, till they saw fit to connect themselves with some larger sovereignty. They said that they had been arbitrarily connected, first with one government and then with another, at the caprice of royal authority; but that authority was annulled by the Revolution, and the right, which had always been theirs, having now come into their own hands, they chose to decide for themselves their State connection.

Various conventions of these discontented towns were held, when, at Charlestown, 1781, these towns, with a number from Vermont, decided to unite with New Hampshire, and become a part of that sovereignty. This alarmed Vermont, and by the diplomacy of Ira Allen the committee of the convention were persuaded to substitute Vermont for New Hampshire. New Hampshire in her turn was alarmed at the threatened loss of so large a part of her territory, and uttered threats and protests. Nevertheless, the New Hampshire towns consummated the union. Congress again declared that Vermont could receive no recognition until she abandoned all claim to territory of New Hampshire and New York. General Washington wrote an unofficial letter to the Vermont authorities advising them to dismiss all claims to the New Hampshire towns, and intimated the necessity of coercion if she refused; whereupon she receded again from union with the towns on the east of the Connecticut River. The New Hampshire towns remained for a time independent, but finally returned to their allegiance.

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY, 1881-82, make

a pamphlet of seventy-two pages. They contain a brief abstract of the proceedings of the year, with the address of the President, the late Hon. Zachariah Allen. There were many meetings of the Society during the year, and at twelve of them papers were read. The address of the President, after a résumé of the history of the Society for the year, and an exposition of its present condition, elaborately discusses the question, Why the Rhode Island Colony was subjected to hostile aggression from the other four Colonial Corporations of New England, and why it was excluded from the Confederation which was known as The Four United Colonies of New England. The general impression is that the hostility to the Rhode Island Colony had its origin in difference of religious opinion. Mr. Allen, with abundance of historic illustration, maintains that it was due rather to greed of gain, and that Roger Williams was banished because he denied the right of magistrates in the Bay Company to take the lands of the Indians without compensation to the aboriginal owners, and for the same reason he and his followers were persecuted in their new homes. While the point is not new, it is timely in the general re-examination that is making of the true history of New England, and we are glad to see such a collection of authorities preserved in a permanent form. Rhode Island owes it to herself to vindicate her own history.

THE LONG ISLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY held its annual meeting at the rooms of the Society, on Tuesday evening, May 9, the Rev. Dr. R. S. Storrs, the President, occupying the chair. By the report of the

Directors, it appeared that during the year there had been 35 deaths, and 137 had been added to the membership. There are at this time 881 annual members, and 572 life members. Appropriate notice was taken of the gift to the Society by Mr. George I. Seney of \$29,000 to buy books, in addition to a special fund, and 4,655 volumes were added to the library. Addresses were made by the Rev. Dr. Henry C. Potter, of New York, and the Rev. Dr. Storrs.

MAINE HISTORICAL SOCIETY—The last meeting of the society was one of considerable interest. The Librarian, Mr. H. W. Bryant, in his last report shows that the collections of the society in its new quarters at Portland are growing rapidly. He acknowledges the fourth case of books from Mr. E. F. Duren. He says:

"This case alone contains upwards of five hundred different titles. We are also indebted to Deacon Duren for a profile likeness of his distinguished grandfather, the late Judge Samuel Freeman, born in 1743, died 1831. Judge Freeman is said to have resembled General Washington, and the profile shows a similarity in the contour and size of his head. With the profile is received an advertisement of Judge Freeman's paper mill, in Saccarappa. It is called a 'Rag Lesson,' and it is as quaint as the language of poor Richard himself, whom the Judge evidently revered.

"The gift, by S. I. Boardman, Esq., of Augusta, of the *United States Literary Gazette* for 1824-25 is very opportune, as it contains the earliest poems of Longfellow."

LITERARY NOTICES

THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE, EXTENDING FROM THE EARLIEST SAXON TRANSLATIONS TO THE PRESENT ANGLO-AMERICAN REVISION. With Special Reference to the Protestant Religion and the English Language. By BLACKFORD CONDIT. Pp. 469. A. S. BARNES & Co. New York and Chicago, 1882.

The recent publication of what may be called the Westminster Version of the New Testament has served to show what a large hold the English Bible has upon the popular mind. On the day of its issue there were in this country advance orders for it by the hundred thousand. Edition after edition has since been sold, until the number of copies in circulation can only be expressed by seven figures. The secular press reprinted it as supplements; it was the subject of discussion in their columns, as well as in the quarterlies and the religious weeklies. It was, for a time at least, a fashion, and we had become, as it were in a day, a nation of Bible readers. It was only natural that the interest in one version should inspire an interest in all versions, and that men should desire to know something of the history of the English Bible, something of the origin and pedigree of a book which, more than all other books, had influenced not only our religion, but our language and our literature. A ready welcome was thus prepared for a work like that of Mr. Condit; it gives, in chronological order, the information and facts that were most desired. It was characteristic of the Saxons that they would have the Bible in "a tongue understood of the people," and as early as the year 680, Caedmon made a poetical paraphrase of portions of the Holy Scriptures. With this paraphrase Mr. Condit begins his work, telling what remains of its history and giving specimens of its language, that we may better contrast it with our own version. This course he pursues in his subsequent chapters, and we are thus able to trace our language through twelve hundred years, during many of which, aside from some books of devotion, the Bible was almost the only book, and to it, perhaps more than to all other sources, we owe the present form and structure of our English tongue. After Caedmon had showed the way, paraphrases and versions multiplied, and it was no small undertaking to bring together in one view the history of them all, to trace the Word through Guthlac, Aldhelm, King Alfred, Schorham, Wycliffe, Tynedale, Coverdale, Matthews, Cromwell, Chekes, the Geneva, the Bishops, Rheims, Douay, and King James' Bibles, to say nothing of the multitude of other versions both before and since our authorized version. The facts were widely scat-

tered, and it required patience, judgment, and learning to gather and properly present them. These Mr. Condit has exercised, and his work is admirably done. We have here all that the general reader can need in his investigation of the subject, and to those who would pursue their researches farther and verify the author's statements and facts, the means are furnished in the copious references and footnotes which are given. A mere glance at them will show how wide a range of reading they cover. It will also show that the reading has not been confined to works of a past age, but that the literature of the subject in our own day has been diligently studied, and, if he quotes "Fox's Martyrs," as he needs must, so also he refers to works like Green's "History of the English People." In examining Mr. Condit's volume the reader will be particularly struck with the struggle for ascendancy between the Anglo-Saxon and the Latin tongues. It was for freedom and independence, as it began before and was continued after the Norman Conquest. If the Latin prevailed, it meant dependence and inferiority, not only in literature and language, but in politics and religion. It was not in the nature of things for the Saxon to be dependent, either in civil or in ecclesiastical matters, and when the Latin tongue was rooted out, he became really free. We cordially commend this volume to our readers; it is a story that has been often told, but not often so briefly and admirably. It will find a permanent place in our literature. The publishers have shown their appreciation of it by giving it a handsome form and binding, and as a frontispiece a portrait of Wycliffe. If not the Alpha and Omega upon the history of the English Bible, as the symbol on the cover might seem to indicate, it will be long before it will have a successor of equal worth.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON, BY HENRY CABOT LODGE. Pp. 306. Boston: HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & Co., 1882.

Among the men who laid the broad foundations of this Government, not the least distinguished was Alexander Hamilton. The marks of his genius and statesmanship are to be seen in our Constitution, and his influence has largely shaped the policy of the Republic during the century of its existence. It is hardly too much to say that but for him we might have had no Constitution, and that the confederation of States might have gone to pieces, wrecked by intestine strife. He had served the country in the Cabinet and in the field, and in both had been the counsellor and friend upon whom Washington leaned. But foremost man as he was; invaluable as were his services; leaving behind him in the *Federalist* and other papers the commentary upon the Constitution and laws; the father of our financial and

revenue systems; compelling, by his logic and eloquence, the adoption of the Constitution, and so saving it in the New York Convention; saving the country from falling into the hands of a miscreant like Burr—despite all these and many other services of like nature, it is remarkable that we have never had a popular life of Hamilton. We have had various attempts to write his life more or less complete, beginning with 1804, and ending with 1870, but none of them has been of a popular character. They have done much to preserve his fame as a statesman, and but little to give him his deserved place in the hearts of the people. It remains to be seen whether the work of Mr. Lodge will supply a real want. It is the second of the series of American statesmen projected by the publishers, and might, perhaps, but for local pride, have been first on the list, for certainly Hamilton held no second rank in the long line; there are few of them to whose greatness he has not largely contributed from his storehouse of thought. Mr. Lodge, in some respects, was eminently fitted for the task he has chosen, as he exemplified in his work on the American colonies. He has given us a volume full of absorbing interest to men of thought and culture—men who are studying the origin and theory of government, or the career of the soldier, lawyer, and statesman, but he does not tell us, or at any rate in sufficient detail, what we most want to know of the man. He discusses at full length in the appendix the moot question of Hamilton's birth, but has little to say of his death. Law and Politics, The Constitution, The Treasury and the Financial Policy, Party Contests—these are some of the subjects necessarily treated in any life of Hamilton as a statesman; but there is another and a different side even to the life of a statesman. He was a husband, a father, a friend; he was a Christian man; and these are points passed lightly over. We fear a life of Hamilton for the people, which shall teach them to garner him in their hearts, remains still to be written. The material is ample: it can be gathered from the even volumes of the Republic and from other sources, and it would make a good companion to the sketch of Mr. Lodge. We are not at all content with Mr. Lodge's explanation of Hamilton's consent to be forced into the duel with Burr—that it was from a fear lest a refusal might disqualify him to serve his country afterward in some expected emergency. We believe that he was actuated simply by deference to the sentiment of the age. The code was everywhere accepted; he had been a soldier, and there must be no doubt of his courage. He had the sense to abhor the whole system, and he so declared on his death-bed. In the letter he left, to be given to his wife in case he fell, he wrote: "The scruples of a Christian have determined me to expose my own life to any extent rather than subject myself to the guilt of taking the life of another;" but he would not so

far rise above his age as to refuse to meet his antagonist. When he fell, he was taken, not to his own home, as Mr. Lodge states, but to the Bayard House, now 82 Jane Street. There Bishop Moore visited him, and the next day administered the Communion to him at his own earnest request, and there he died. The city, the country mourned over his untimely death, as they had over the death of Washington, as they have since for Lincoln and for Garfield; they felt that a great man had fallen.

ECCLESIA ANGLICANA. A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST in England, from the Earliest to the Present Times. By the Rev. ARTHUR CHARLES JENNINGS, M.A., Jesus College, Cambridge, Vicar of Whittlesford. Pp. 502. New York: THOMAS WHITTAKER, 1882.

The history of the English Church is in some sense the history of English Christianity in all the world. For many centuries it existed, if we may credit the historian, alone, and it was not until the reign of Queen Elizabeth that the adherents of the Church of Rome, and the various bodies which now with that church represent the Christianity of the English race, became separate communities in Great Britain. Christianity was planted there not later than the second century; the English Church was organized and has since continued. Some would go still further, and insist that the English Church was planted by apostles, or by apostolic men, and derives her hierarchy from the Druidical superstition, and see in its flamens and arch-flamens the Bishop and Archbishops of the Christian Church, but fond dreams like this we may easily dismiss, and see in them what Thomas Fuller quaintly calls the flams and arch-flams of history. This is not the fault of the author of *Ecclesia Anglicana*, and he handles the vague traditions that have come down through the ages, covered with the dust of antiquity and sustained by no sufficient evidence, cautiously and carefully. He deals not with conjecture and surmise, but with proved facts. He holds the pen, not of a partisan, but of a historian. Such are his candor and impartial mind, that he carries us with him in his conclusions, and his history of the Church of the Celts and of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons has a real interest for us, as being not fiction, as is sometimes urged, but history. We follow him through the Anglo-Norman period, through the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries, through the Reformation, and down to the times of James the First, and it is easy to see that we are studying the history of the Christianity of our own country. All of our great religious bodies, so far as they are of English origin, owe their source and deri-

vation to the English Church: her history is their history. It is in this way that Ecclesia Anglicana finds a place for notice in these columns, not because it is a history of the English Church, but because it is a history of English, and, therefore, of American Christianity, because whatever may be our affiliations, we find here the ancestral home and trace the descent of our heritage. Mr. Jennings has worked with diligence and with judgment, and while his history was primarily intended for students, it will be found no less suited to the general reader. We should not like to endorse all his facts or conclusions; we note some things where we believe he is mistaken, some things that he has omitted, some confusion in manner; but, upon the whole, his book will be found trustworthy and valuable. It is, however, unfortunate that in it, where there is any direct allusion to this country, the author does not seem to have been aware of the difference between the Pilgrims of the Mayflower and the Independents of Massachusetts Bay. But we can speak in terms of high praise of his volume as a whole, and we regard it as a valuable contribution to history. It is handsomely printed, and there is a good index.

CEREMONY AT THE SEALING OF THE CENTURY BOX BY THE ANCIENT AND HONORABLE ARTILLERY COMPANY, in Faneuil Hall, Boston, on the evening of Forefathers' Day, December 22, 1881, to be transmitted to their successors in 1980. 8vo, pp. 39. Boston, 1882.

This is the account of a most interesting ceremony, such, doubtless, as never before occurred in America. The Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Boston, the oldest military organization in the United States, when preparing to participate in the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the settlement of Boston, in 1880, remembered that when it was the military escort at the two hundredth anniversary of the same occurrence in 1830, a roll of its members doing duty had been carefully preserved in the records. It was discovered that of the ninety-five officers and men on the roll of 1830, only thirteen survived the fifty years, among whom are Hons. Marshall P. Wilder, Robert C. Winthrop, and the venerable Josiah Quincy. Of those on the roll in 1880 it is not possible that *one* will survive the century to elapse before the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary arrives. The idea—so suggestive—of preserving this list expanded into a resolution, unanimously adopted, that a committee prepare rolls of present members, with brief details of each one's history, to collect documents, papers, and such other material as could be best transmitted, and seal the same in copper or tin

boxes, not to be unsealed until the years 1930 and 1980 respectively. In addition to this, thirty gentlemen, mostly men of letters, were invited to prepare papers on various living subjects of general interest at the present day, confidential manuscripts, to be preserved in these boxes. Twenty-seven such papers were written. One paper, on Architecture, by Henry Walter Hartwell, was illustrated by thirty-two photographs of public buildings. These and other articles of value which will convey to posterity fifty or one hundred years hence faithful and full accounts of the present day, were, on the 22d of December, 1881—Forefathers' Day—and in the presence of a thousand witnesses, sealed in a copper box, and that in another box also full of similar articles, the one marked 1980, the other 1930, and delivered to the custody of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company for safe keeping and transmittal.

HISTORY OF THE INDIAN WARS OF NEW ENGLAND, With Eliot the Apostle. Fifty Years in the Midst of Them. Vols. I. and II. By COL. ROBERT BRODEY CAVERLY, author of Genealogical, Poetical, and other works. 8vo, pp. 396 and 398. Boston: JAMES H. EARLE, 1882.

The two volumes, bound in one, are accompanied by fourteen illustrations, being dedicated to the Rev. Elias Nason. The volumes are full of fight, but, nevertheless, they also represent the amenities of literature and civilization, appealing, at the same time, to a large class of readers.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Condition of the Institution for the Year 1880. 8vo, pp. 772. Washington: GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, 1881.

This volume has the uninviting appearance which invests so many public documents, but is, nevertheless, one of large value and considerable interest, though the contents are too numerous to be dwelt upon. No less than a hundred and twelve pages are devoted to a bibliography of Herschell's writings. An illustrated article is devoted to the wonderful Luray Cavern, in Page County, Virginia.

RALPH WALDO EMERSON. BY C. A. BARTOL. 8vo, pp. 20. Boston: A. WILLIAMS & Co., 283 Washington Street, 1882.

